

Banking and Bookkeeping

Against stupidity, the Gods themselves contend in vain.

– JC FRIEDRICH VON SCHILLER

As a dog returneth to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly.

– PROVERBS 26:11

12.1 Introduction

The cashless payment industry is one of the winners from the coronavirus pandemic, as people worldwide abandon cash in favour of card and phone payments. The underlying banking systems range from payment card processing and home banking through high-value interbank money transfers to the back-end bookkeeping systems that keep track of it all and settle up afterwards. There are specialised networks for everything from stock trading to trade payments, many of which are open to other companies too. Larger companies have internal bookkeeping and cash management systems that mirror many of the functions of a bank.

Such systems matter to the security engineer for a number of reasons. First, they're a core professional competence. You need to understand transaction processing to tackle the wider problems of fraud, and this chapter will give you a road map. You also need to understand internal controls based on bookkeeping, as these not only give early warnings when things go wrong, but also drive corporate risk management. You have to be able to carry a conversation about Gramm-Leach-Bliley, Sarbanes-Oxley and PCI DSS to have credibility with your CFO. When you propose protection mechanisms, one of the first things you're likely to be asked is how they'll help executives discharge their fiduciary responsibilities to shareholders.

Second, bookkeeping drove the computer industry. The first computer outside the military and academia was the Leo, which did bookkeeping for

the Lyons chain of coffee houses from 1951. Banking rapidly became the most intensive application area for computing, which spread into other firms via the automation of bookkeeping from the 1960s. So the protection of bookkeeping systems is of both historical and practical importance. It also gives us a well-understood model of protection in which confidentiality plays little role, but where the integrity of records (and their immutability once made) is paramount. A banking system should prevent customers from cheating each other, or the bank; it should prevent bank staff from cheating the bank, or its customers; and the evidence it provides should be good enough that none of them can get away with falsely accusing others of cheating. Banking and bookkeeping pioneered the use of dual control, also known nowadays as multi-party authorisation.

Third, transaction processing systems – whether for \$50 ATM withdrawals, or \$100m wire transfers – were the application that launched commercial cryptology as a separate discipline outside the military. They drove the development of encryption algorithms and protocols, as well as the supporting technology such as smartcards. Many instructive mistakes were first made (or at least publicly documented) in the area of financial cryptography.

Finally, many of the global-scale systems we've built this century were designed to circumvent the checks and balances that had evolved over centuries in the local and manual systems they replaced. Google's mission was to make all the world's information available by disrupting the previous implicit and explicit controls of locality, scale, confidence and copyright. Uber planned to become the global taxi company by circumventing taxi regulations in thousands of towns and cities worldwide. It's hardly surprising that a successful startup often has to reinvent controls, whether under pressure from fraud and abuse, or under pressure from lawmakers.

In this chapter, I'll first describe the bookkeeping systems used to track assets and manage the risk of corrupt staff; such accounting systems are also used by other companies of any size. I'll then describe the international funds-transfer systems used for interbank payments. Next, I'll describe ATM systems, the public face of banking, whose technology has also been adopted in applications such as utility meters. I'll follow with the story of credit cards, which have become the main payment mechanism online. I'll then move on to more recent technical advances, including contactless payments, phone payments and open banking.

12.2 Bookkeeping systems

Bookkeeping appears to have been invented in the Middle East in about 8500 BC, just after agriculture [1666]. When people started to produce surplus food, they started to store and trade it. Suddenly they needed a way to keep track of

which villager put what in the communal warehouse. To start with, each unit of food (sheep, wheat, oil, ...) was represented by a clay token, or *bullā*, which was placed inside a clay envelope, sealed by rolling it with the pattern of the warehouse keeper and then baked in a kiln, as we can see in Figure 12.1. When the farmer wanted to get his food back, the seal was broken by the keeper in the presence of a witness. (This may be the oldest known security protocol.) By about 3000BC, this had led to the invention of writing [1517]; after another thousand years, we find equivalents of promissory notes, bills of lading, and so on. At about the same time, metal ingots started to be used as an intermediate commodity, often sealed inside a *bullā* by an assayer. In 700BC, Lydia's King Croesus started stamping the metal directly and thus invented coins [1554]. By the Athens of Pericles, a number of wealthy individuals were in business as bankers [773].



Figure 12.1: Clay envelope and its content of tokens representing 7 jars of oil, from Uruk, present day Iraq, ca. 3300 BC (courtesy Denise Schmandt-Besserat and the Louvre Museum)

The next significant innovation dates to medieval times. As the dark ages came to a close and trade started to grow, some businesses became too large for a single family to manage. The earliest recognisably modern banks date to this period; by having branches in a number of cities, they could finance trade. But for firms to grow beyond the ability of the owner's family to supervise them directly, they had to hire managers from outside. The mechanism that evolved to control the risk of fraud was *double-entry bookkeeping*. Historians have found double-entry records created by Jewish merchants in twelfth-century Cairo [1694], though the first book on the subject did not appear until 1494 [522].

12.2.1 Double-entry bookkeeping

The idea behind double-entry bookkeeping is simple: each transaction is posted to two separate books, as a credit in one and a debit in the other. For example, when a firm sells a customer \$100 worth of goods on credit, it posts a \$100 credit on the Sales account, and a \$100 debit to the Receivables account. When the customer pays the money, it will credit the Receivables account (thereby reducing the asset of 'money receivable'), and debit the Cash account. (The principle taught in accountancy school is 'debit the receiver, credit the giver'.) At the end of the day, the books should *balance*, that is, add up to zero; the assets and the liabilities should be equal. In all but the smallest firms, the books were kept by different clerks.

We arrange things so that each branch can be balanced separately. Each cashier will balance their cash tray before locking it in the vault overnight; the debits in the cash ledger should exactly balance the physical banknotes they've collected. So most frauds need the collusion of two or more people, and this principle of *split responsibility*, also known as *dual control* or *multi-party authorisation* (MPA), is complemented by audit. Not only are the books audited at year end, but there are random audits too; inspectors may descend on a branch at no notice and insist that all the books are balanced before the staff go home.

Technology arrived in 1879, when the 'Incorruptible Cashier' patent of James Ritty of Dayton, Ohio, introduced the cash register with a bell and a paper tape. Ritty was a saloon owner whose employees stole money from him. He sold his patent to John H. Patterson, who founded the National Cash Register Company, which not only became a leading supplier of banking and bookkeeping equipment, but spun off IBM, which dominated the computer industry until Microsoft displaced it in the 1990s.

12.2.2 Bookkeeping in banks

Banks were early adopters of computers for bookkeeping. Starting in the late 1950s and early 1960s with applications such as cheque processing, they found that even the slow and expensive computers of the time were much cheaper than armies of clerks. The 1960s saw banks offering automated payroll services to their corporate customers. ATMs arrived en masse in the 1970s, with the first online banking systems in the 1980s; web-based banking followed in the 1990s. Yet today's slick online systems still rely on legacy back-office automation.

The law in the US, Europe and most developed countries requires not just banks but all public companies to have effective internal controls, and makes executives responsible for them. Such laws are the main drivers of investment in information security mechanisms. Computer systems used for bookkeeping typically claim to implement variations on the double-entry theme, but the

quality is variable. The separation-of-duty features may be just a skin in the user interface, while the underlying data are open to manipulation by technical staff. For example, if the ledgers are all just views of one single database, then someone with physical access and a database editing tool might bypass the controls. Staff may also notice loopholes and exploit them. For example, one bank didn't audit address changes, until a cashier found he could change a customer's address, issue an extra bank card, and change it back again [55]. So we need to look at the mechanics, and banking is the natural place to start.

A traditional core banking system has a number of data structures: an *account master file*, which contains each customer's current balance together with previous transactions for a period of perhaps ninety days; a number of *ledgers* which track cash and other assets on their way through the system; various *journals* of transactions that have been received from cash machines, teller stations, merchant terminals and so on, but not yet posted to the ledgers; and an *audit trail* that records who did what and when. The systems used by the large UK banks are relatively unchanged since the last century, though a number of peripherals have been added, notably phone banking¹.

The core banking software will apply the transactions from the journals to the various ledgers and the account master file. So when a customer walks into a branch and pays \$100 into their savings account, the teller will make a transaction that records a credit to the customer's savings account of \$100 while debiting the same amount to the cash ledger recording the amount of money in the drawer.

This was traditionally done overnight in a batch process but increasingly involves real-time online processing, so things can go wrong more quickly. The fact that all the ledgers should always add up to zero provides an important check. If the bank (or one of its branches) is ever out of balance, an alarm will go off, some processing will stop, and inspectors will start looking for the cause. So a programmer who wants to add to their own account balance has to take the money from some other account, rather than just creating it out of thin air by tweaking the account master file. Just as a traditional business had different ledgers managed by different clerks, so a banking data processing shop will have different development teams in charge of different subsystems. In addition, all code is subjected to scrutiny by an internal auditor, and to testing by a separate test department. Once it has been approved, it will be run on a production machine that does not have a development environment, but only approved object code and data. (The principle that a different team runs production systems than the developers who wrote it is now coming under strain in the new world of DevOps.)

¹Most retail banking transactions nowadays are balance enquiries from phones, which are typically dealt with by a front end that gets regular updates from the core system. This minimises load on the core system, and also minimises the complaints when it goes down.

12.2.3 The Clark-Wilson security policy model

Although such systems had evolved since the 1960s, a formal model of their security policy was only introduced in 1987 by Dave Clark and Dave Wilson (the former a computer scientist, and the latter an accountant) [438]. In this model, some data items are constrained so that they can only be acted on by a certain set of transformation procedures.

More formally, there are special procedures whereby data can be input – turned from an *unconstrained data item*, or UDI, into a *constrained data item*, or CDI; *integrity verification procedures* (IVPs) to check the validity of any CDI (e.g., that the books balance); and *transformation procedures* (TPs), which may be thought of in the banking case as transactions that preserve balance. In the general case, they maintain the integrity of CDIs. They also write enough information to an append-only CDI (the audit trail) for transactions to be reconstructed. Access control is by means of triples (*subject, TP, CDI*), which are so structured that a multi-party authorisation policy is enforced. In the formulation in [48]:

1. the system will have an IVP for validating the integrity of any CDI;
2. the application of a TP to any CDI must maintain its integrity;
3. a CDI can only be changed by a TP;
4. subjects can only initiate certain TPs on certain CDIs;
5. triples must enforce an appropriate separation-of-duty policy on subjects;
6. certain special TPs on UDIs can produce CDIs as output;
7. each application of a TP must cause enough information to reconstruct it to be written to a special append-only CDI;
8. the system must authenticate subjects attempting to initiate a TP;
9. the system must let only special subjects (i.e., security officers) make changes to authorization-related lists.

A number of things bear saying. First, unlike Bell-LaPadula, the Clark-Wilson model involves maintaining state. In addition to the audit trail, this is usually necessary for dual control as you have to keep track of which transactions have been partially approved – such as those approved by only one manager and waiting for sign-off by a second.

Second, the model doesn't do everything. It captures the idea that state transitions should preserve an invariant such as balance, but not that state transitions should be correct. This model doesn't stop you paying cash into the wrong bank account.

Third, the hard question remains, namely: how do we control the risks from dishonest staff? Rule 5 says that 'an appropriate separation-of-duty policy'

must be supported, but nothing about what this means. Indeed, it's difficult to find any systematic discussion in the accounting literature of how you design internal controls.

What happens in practice is that the big four accountancy firms have a list of controls that they push to their audit clients – a typical company may have a checklist of about 300 internal controls that it has to maintain, depending on what sector it's in. These lists get steadily longer in response to incidents, fears, and regulatory requirements. Many controls are formal compliance rather than real risk reduction, and some are actually harmful. I discussed in section 3.4.4.3 how the big four auditors seized on NIST advice in the 1990s to get people to change their passwords every month; at the time of writing (2020) they are still pushing their audit clients to do this. Yet NIST retracted its advice years ago in the face of the evidence, and Britain's GCHQ also advises companies against password aging.

A principled approach to internal control is possible, and indeed desirable. In the following section, I try to distill the experience gained from working at the coalface in banking and consultancy, and more recently in university governance.

12.2.4 Designing internal controls

Over the years, various standards for bookkeeping and internal control have been promoted by the accountancy profession, by lawgivers and by banking regulators. In the US, there's the *Committee of Sponsoring Organizations (COSO)*, a group of accounting and auditing bodies [462]. However, self-regulation failed to stop the excesses of the dotcom era, and following the collapse of Enron there was intervention from US lawmakers in the form of the *Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX)* of 2002. SOX regulates all US public companies, making senior executives responsible for the accuracy and completeness of financial reports, whose truthfulness CEOs have to certify; protecting whistleblowers, who are the main source of information on insider fraud; and making managers responsible for maintaining "adequate internal control structure and procedures for financial reporting". It also demands that auditors disclose any "material weaknesses". Most of the compliance costs of SOX are reckoned to come from internal controls. Earlier, the *Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA)* of 1999 had liberalised bank regulation in many respects but obliged banks to have security mechanisms to protect information from foreseeable threats in security and integrity. Along with HIPAA in the medical sector, and PCI DSS that I'll discuss later in section 12.5.2, GLBA and SOX have driven much of the investment in information security and internal control. These regulations have helped consolidate the Big Four accountancy firms' influence over corporate policy on internal control.

In this section, our focus is on the technical aspects. Modern risk-management systems typically require a company to identify and assess its risks, and then build controls to mitigate them. The company will typically have a risk register containing many pages of major risk items such as ‘loss of working capital due to large unauthorised bank transaction by insider’ (I’ll discuss this in more detail in section 27.2). Some of them will be mitigated using non-technical measures such as insurance, but all should have a risk owner among the senior executives, and a number of these risks will end up in the CIO’s lap².

The auditors’ work will be driven by the International Auditing and Assurance Standard Board’s “International Standard on Auditing 315” [952]. ISA 315 focuses on the risk of a material misstatement in an organisation’s accounts, whether due to error or to fraud. The auditors are supposed to understand the business and its system of internal control; they will identify significant accounts (such as Cash), significant assertions for each account (such as Existence) and the significant business processes (such as Sales) that impact them, along with the controls those processes contain. They then work through the risk that each assertion might be false and whether the risk is material. So how do you engineer proper controls? The latest version of ISA 315 has quite a few pages on this, but they are mostly somewhat general³, so their interpretation is often down to the accountancy firms.

As we’ll discuss in Part 3, there are two basic approaches to assuring safety against errors and security against attacks. You can work top-down, starting off from the list of bad things you want to not happen, such as ‘large unauthorised wire transfer’, then enumerating the possible causes and identifying controls to mitigate the risks; or you can work bottom-up, starting off from things that might fail, such as ‘a member of staff being blackmailed’, work out what harm might result, and again identify appropriate controls. You may often have to use both approaches. When supporting audit, you need to pay attention to the risks to assertions on which the financial statements rely. However, you cannot ignore other risks that might affect the firm’s ability to operate, such as the loss of a data centre. The internal controls will not be all of your security posture.

Having identified those risks that need to be mitigated by separation of duty, you can do this in two ways: *dual control*, also known as *multi-party authorisation*, and *functional separation*.

In dual control, two or more principals act together to authorize a transaction. The classic military example is in nuclear command systems, which may require two officers to turn their keys simultaneously in consoles that are too far apart for either to reach both locks (I’ll discuss this in detail in section 15.4). The classic civilian example is when a bank issues a letter of guarantee, which may

²For a description of risk governance in a UK bank, see the Financial Conduct Authority’s report into the 2016 fraud against Tesco Bank [687], which I discuss in section 12.6.3.

³See paragraphs A6, A123–181, A198, A224–229 and Appendix 3 paragraphs 15–24.

undertake to carry the loss should a loan made by another bank go sour. Guarantees are particularly prone to fraud. If you can get bank A to guarantee a loan to your business from bank B, then bank B is supervising your account while bank A's money is at risk. A crook with a forged or corruptly-obtained guarantee can take their time to plunder the loan account at bank B, with the alarm only being raised when they default and bank B asks bank A for the money. You don't want a single manager to be able to issue such an instrument⁴.

With functional separation of duty, two or more staff members act on a transaction in complementary ways. The classic example is corporate purchasing. A line manager takes a purchase decision and tells the purchasing department; a clerk there raises a purchase order; the store clerk records the goods' arrival; an invoice arrives at accounts; the accounts clerk correlates it with the purchase order and the stores receipt and raises a cheque; and the accounts manager signs the cheque.

However, it doesn't stop there. The line manager now gets a debit on their monthly statement for that internal account, their boss reviews the accounts to make sure the division's profit targets are likely to be met, the internal audit department can descend at any time to audit the division's books, and when the external auditors come in once a year they will check the books of a randomly selected sample of departments. Finally, when frauds are discovered, the company's lawyers may make vigorous efforts to get the money back.

The model can be summarised as *prevent – detect – recover*. The reliance placed on each of these three legs will depend on the application. Where detection may be delayed, and recovery may therefore be difficult – as with corrupt bank guarantees – you put extra effort into prevention, perhaps using dual control. Where it's prevention that's hard, you can make detection fast enough, and recovery vigorous enough, to provide a deterrent. The classic example here is that bank cashiers can easily take cash, so you count the money every day before they go home.

Management control based on bookkeeping is not only one of the earliest security systems; it has given rise to a lot of management science and civil law. Controls work best where the roles are complementary parts of the existing business process, and some processes have evolved over centuries to support them. Controls are not only entwined with these processes, but exist in the firm's cultural context. In Swiss banks, there are two managers' signatures on almost everything, while Americans are much more relaxed. In most countries' banks, staff can be moved randomly from one task to another, and are forced to take a one-week or even two-week holiday, with no computer or building access, at least once a year. This would not be acceptable in a university – but in academia there's a lot less to steal.

⁴Nowadays the issue is not just whether two managers might collude, or one of them impersonate the other, but whether malware might take over both their accounts. I'll discuss this further in section 12.3.3.

Designing an internal control system is highly interdisciplinary. The financial controllers, the personnel department, the lawyers, the auditors and the systems people all come at the problem from different directions, offer partial solutions, fail to understand each other's control objectives, and things fall down the hole in the middle. Human factors are often neglected, and systems end up vulnerable when helpful subordinates or authoritarian managers circumvent the control to get their work done. It's important to match the controls to the culture, and motivate people to use them; the better run banks sell management controls to staff as a means of protecting them against blackmail and kidnapping. As we noted in Chapter 3, staff in an organisation only have so much compliance budget – they're only prepared to spend so much time and effort performing security rituals that get in the way. Controls that become rituals may also be practised for many years after their purpose has been forgotten or become irrelevant. You have to understand all this and spend the compliance budget wisely on achieving culturally feasible effects. A culture of limited trust of close colleagues is particularly difficult to sustain (another reason why functional controls split across business units may be more effective).

And just as you will try to require more than one banker to approve a large transaction, you may want to require more than one engineer to approve code to run on a live system. But this is hard to do thoroughly for a number of reasons. First, many interfaces provide single points of failure. Second, split-responsibility systems administration is just too tedious. With care you can make it auditable⁵. Third, dual controls often require persistent state, which is in tension with programmers' wish to keep things simple by making transactions atomic. And as that state needs to be managed, there are always some trusted sysadmins who need full access in order to do their jobs. Fourth, as firms move to integrating development and operations as DevOps, and then add security to make it DevSecOps, they may end up with more trusted staff. At the very least, the location of trust may change, as more of it shifts to the source code review phase. Fifth, there are emergencies. The ATM system goes down at the weekend, and the ATM team's on-call engineer gets access to the live system from home to fix the bug. You log such accesses and get your auditors to stare at the logs, as with the sysadmins. Finally, it's inevitable that your top engineers will be so much more knowledgeable than your auditors that they could do bad things if they really wanted to.

So there are always engineers who could commit fraud. A sysadmin might create two shadow users who between them authorise a large payment, or a payment system maintainer might pop an extra payment into the queue. Where they get caught is when the balancing controls set off the alarm after a

⁵Old-time banking systems were built on the IBM operating system MVS, which would let the sysadmin do anything, except finding out which of their activities the auditor was monitoring [225].

day or two, and the money-laundering controls at the bank to which they wire the money stop them getting away with very much. I'll discuss this further in section 12.3.3. The take-home is that functional controls along the *prevent – detect – recover* model are often more important than shared control, as they separate know-how as well as access. But for functional separation to work, the mechanisms need to be engineered into the application, so they may be proprietary, obscure and less well tested than the mechanisms that come with operating systems. And there are limits to how much you can separate know-how. Some people have to understand it all, such as the security architect and the chief auditor.

The same analysis holds for the business processes themselves. Some people end up having to take high-value decisions quickly and have to understand all the aspects of a deal. At a real bank, you might find thirty or forty people you just have to trust – the CEO, the chief dealer, the top sysadmins and a number of others. It's important to know who they are, to minimise their numbers, to pay them well, and to watch them discreetly.

A final remark on dual control is that it gets fragile at organizational interfaces. One example is that banks in California suddenly started ignoring requests that cheques have two signatures after they installed new processing equipment [1624]. Some organisations are unwilling to show competitors who's trusted to sign and for how much. And then there's dispute resolution: 'My two managers say the money was sent!' 'But my two say it wasn't!'

12.2.5 Insider frauds

Theft and fraud can take many forms. Most thefts from the average company are due to insiders, and automation seems to be making the incidents both rarer and larger.

Back when most bankers worked in branches, banks in the English-speaking world sacked some 1% of staff each year. The typical offence was minor embezzlement with a loss of a few thousand dollars. No-one found an effective way of predicting which staff would go bad; previously loyal staff can be thrown off the rails by shocks such as divorce, or by getting a new manager they just can't stand. Losing a few hundred tellers a year was just a cost of doing business. These numbers are falling now that most staff work in call centres; the customers they deal with are allocated randomly to them, so it's hard to collude with a friend. It's also harder nowadays for staff to sell customers' personal information, since staff have to walk a customer through security questions to get access to their record. Staff at well-run banks are typically forbidden from taking phones or even pens and paper into call centres so they can't leak data to outsiders at any scale⁶.

⁶Such opsec rules are making it harder for call centres to get staff to work from home during the Covid pandemic.

Notable insider cases include:

- The biggest recent UK bank fraud was pulled off by a gangster from the East End of Glasgow, Feezan Hameed. ‘Fizzy’ got sent down for 11 years in 2016 for stealing at least £113m from business customers of Lloyds’ Bank in the UK during 2013–15, of which only £47m was recovered⁷. He subverted two members of staff who spotted target companies – typically medium-sized firms with over £1m in their accounts. Fizzy would then phone up the business owner or financial controller, claim to be from the bank, ‘authenticate’ himself by reading them a couple of recent transactions, and ask them to ‘authenticate’ themselves in return by computing an authorisation code on their second-factor device. Before he did this, he’d log on as them and set up a batch of payments for large five-figure sums. The code he got from the victim would release the batch [821].
- A password reset clerk at HSBC conspired with persons unknown to change the password used by AT&T to access their bank account with HSBC. The new password was used to transfer over \$20 million to offshore companies, from which it was not recovered. The clerk was a vulnerable young man who had been employed on password reset after failing internal exams; the court took mercy, and he got away with five years [1572]. It was alleged that an AT&T employee had conspired to cover up the transactions, but that gentleman was acquitted.
- One rapidly-growing bank fraud in the 2010s has involved spear-phishing accounts staff at medium-sized firms and taking over a couple of staff accounts. Owning two clerks’ PCs is simpler than suborning two clerks, and if a firm’s PCs all have the same configuration and update status, it may not be too hard. As a bank may pay extra attention to large transactions, the game is often to make a lot of four-figure payments before the company notices. In the US, companies that don’t notice a fraudulent payment the following day usually have no redress. A typical attack might net half a million.

12.2.6 Executive frauds

All the famous large financial frauds – nine figures and up – have involved senior insiders. The collapse of Barings Bank is a good example: managers failed to control rogue trader Nick Leeson, blinded by greed for the bonuses his apparent trading profits earned them. Other examples include the Equity

⁷Full disclosure: I acted as expert witness for one of the victim companies, and we had to threaten to sue Lloyds to get our money back.

Funding scandal, in which an insurance company's management created thousands of fake people on their computer system, insured them, and sold the policies on to reinsurers; and Robert Maxwell's looting of the Daily Mirror newspaper pension funds in Britain. Either the victim's executives were grossly negligent, as in the case of Barings, or were the perpetrators, as with Equity Funding and Maxwell. And these patterns repeat; for example, Wells Fargo was fined \$3bn in 2020 for opening millions of accounts without the customers' knowledge, just as in the Equity Funding case [699].

Economists and accountancy professors analyse such issues as problems of *agency*: a principal A hires an agent B to manage an asset and wants to know how can B's performance be monitored and assessed. The same principles apply whether the principal is the bank's CEO and the agent is a manager contemplating a fraud; or whether the principal consists of the shareholders and the agent is the CEO. In theory, the internal controls and the internal audit department are the tool used by the CEO to keep track of more junior staff, while the external auditors are the tool used by the shareholders to keep track of the CEO and the senior executives.

That's the theory. The practice was analysed by Alexander Dyck, Adair Morse and Luigi Zingales in a survey of 230 cases of corporate fraud against quoted US companies between 1996 and 2004 [596]. Before Sarbanes-Oxley, only a minority of frauds were revealed by the people mandated to spot them: 14% by the auditors and 6% by the SEC. Most were detected by actors with other incentives: 19% by employees, 16% by industry regulators, 14% by financial analysts and 14% by the media. Stock-exchange regulators, commercial banks and insurance underwriters are notable for their complete absence. After Sarbanes-Oxley the performance of mandated actors improved slightly but still to just over half the total. Their analysis of incentives shows that actors with the strongest incentive to blow the whistle, such as short sellers, were least active, while the most active, employees, often had negative incentives in that they got fired. This suggests that the dominating factor is who actually knows what's going on. Second, rewards promote disclosure: in addition to the effects of Sarbanes-Oxley, many government actors (such as the taxman) reward whistleblowers, with positive effects.

In theory, external auditors are appointed by the board's audit committee, which is chaired by an external director; but who appoints the external directors? In my experience, the external directors tend to be friendly with the CEO and the auditors go out of their way to schmooze the CFO⁸. They offer cheap audits to get their foot in the door, and make their real money from consultancy; this was a structural problem for decades, and eventually in February

⁸The legal infighting following the collapse of Enron destroyed its auditors Arthur Andersen, reducing the 'big five' audit firms to the 'big four'; now auditors go out of their way to avoid liability for fraud.

2020, the UK Financial Reporting Council ordered audit and consultancy to be separated [1051]. The big audit firms have a pernicious effect on the information security world by pushing their own list of favourite controls, regardless of the client's real risks. They maximise their income by nit-picking and compliance; the Sarbanes-Oxley regulations cost the average US public company over \$1m a year in audit fees.

Quite apart from the pure economic incentives, bosses find it hard to cope with evidence that senior colleagues are incompetent or dishonest. There's a whole literature on information avoidance, which I mentioned in section 3.2.4: people are reluctant to learn things that will cause them pain, stress or extra work. And risks that managers are unwilling to confront, they are often unable to control. No-one at Barings wanted to think that their star dealer Nick Leeson might be a crook; and pop went the bank. Such risks are not being mitigated by technology; if anything they may be growing.

12.2.6.1 *The post office case*

Executives can also be unwilling to believe that anything might be going systematically wrong with their accounting systems. Even if they suspect, there's a social reflex to close ranks under criticism, and lawyers may advise clients to just deny everything.

The case worth studying here is the failure of the Post Office accounting system in the UK. The Post Office doesn't just ship letters but is a significant financial institution too, most of whose branches are run by sub-postmasters – typically shopkeepers with a franchised Post Office counter on their premises. To control them, the Post Office built an accounting system called Horizon, which had multiple bugs that caused many franchisees to be charged money they didn't owe. Thousands of people had their lives ruined; some lost their businesses and were bankrupted, some staff were wrongly fired, and several people were jailed for frauds they did not commit. Eventually 587 sub-postmasters sued the Post Office, and in December 2019 they won an apology and £58m. The judge found that Horizon 'was not remotely robust' [186].

This is the first and only case, so far as I know, where an accounting system has been subjected to a proper test in aggressive litigation. Many legal systems presume that accounting systems are working properly unless someone can produce evidence to the contrary, and this can be hard: a lot of the legal effort went into forcing the Post Office to give the claimants access to the software and its documentation so it could be examined by their experts. Incidentally, the total losses to franchisees appear to be in the mid-hundreds of millions; they'll get maybe £11m of the £58m settlement, with the rest going to the lawyers and to the hedge fund that bankrolled the litigation. Most staff at the

Post Office took a pay cut while the CEO Paula Vennels, an ordained minister, got a substantial raise [359]. She eventually left. It may be that the software supplier, Fujitsu, will end up paying for the settlement, but that may require further litigation.

12.2.6.2 Other failures

Most accounting system failures are less spectacular, but there are many failures that have significant effects on the ability of financial and other firms to operate. We'll see more examples as we work through payments in this chapter and other applications in later chapters, but here's a start sample.

1. As computer systems get more complex over time, they accumulate cruft that makes them more fragile and harder to maintain. Software engineers refer to this as *technical debt*: it means that changes become slower and more expensive, and recovery from failures can be complex [42]. Bookkeeping systems are no exception. For example, in June 2012, 6.5 million customers of the Natwest Bank had service disrupted for several weeks following a software upgrade that went wrong and had to be reversed. People were stranded overseas with no money and some companies couldn't make payroll. The bank was fined £42m [686]; it was then largely owned by the UK government as it had gone bust in the crash of 2008. Had the service failure gone on another week, it might well have gone bust again, costing taxpayers tens of billions and causing widespread disruption. So the fear of a catastrophic failure closing a money-centre bank is a real one. But replacing a crufty old core banking system with a new one is a major project taking years and costing nine figures, with its own strategic risks. As a young man I worked on a couple of such projects: they have their nail-biting moments.
2. We find similar project risks further down the food chain. Our university's accounting system was replaced in the early 2000s, and a project that should have cost £3m cost £11m instead. We ended up suing the accountancy firm that installed it, and published a detailed report of what went wrong [691].
3. The system is still, years later, a pain to use, and the reason why may be of interest. At our university, 35 finance-office staff have more say in the design of the finance system than 1,500 professors. The clerks care more, as they use it all the time, while we professors might use it for an hour or two a week. The time saved by clerks is less than the time wasted by professors, but the concentrated interest usually wins.

So even if your bookkeeping system uses a standard core that enforces the basic Clark-Wilson properties of balance and integrity, there's still a lot to go wrong.

12.2.6.3 Ecological validity

And it's not enough to just check that the books are internally consistent. You also need to check that they correspond to external reality. The series of scandals that shaped modern audit requirements and practice began with the collapse in 1938 of McKesson and Robbins, a well-known drug and chemical company with reported assets of \$100m⁹. It turned out that 20% of the recorded assets and inventory did not exist. The president, Philip Musica, turned out to be a bootlegger with a previous fraud conviction; with his three brothers, he inflated the firm's figures using a fake foreign drug business involving a bogus shipping agent and a fake Montreal bank. The auditors had accepted the McKesson account without making enquiries about the company's bosses; they failed to check inventories, verify accounts receivable with customers, or think about separation of duties within the company [1619].

The famous case for the next generation was the salad oil scandal of 1963, involving the bankruptcy of the Allied Crude Oil Refining Corporation and the prosecution by Robert F. Kennedy of its CEO, Tino de Angelis. Allied had borrowed millions from American Express and others against tanks of soybean oil that were actually mostly water, and used this to trade heavily in futures [1444]. American Express stock dropped by 50% after a whistleblower told it of the fraud; it lost \$58m. (Warren Buffett then bought 5% of the company and made a fortune.)

The requirement that all big firms be audited has entangled audit firms in pretty well every major financial scandal. I already mentioned Enron, whose failure in 2001 led to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, and then there was the financial crisis in 2008 caused in part by trading complicated financial derivatives that turned out to be based on near-worthless mortgages. And one issue with the blockchain systems currently being promoted for some payment and bookkeeping applications is that while the mathematical structure may give guarantees of consistency and consensus, there is no information whatsoever about whether the assets referred to are sound, or even exist. So you might be somewhat sceptical when you see a bank talking about a blockchain to register mortgages, on which smart contracts will allow financial innovation. I'll return to this in section 20.7.

The most recent scandal as this book went to press in September 2020 was Wirecard. A payment service firm, it had started out processing card payments to porn sites, online casinos and other merchants that normal banks wouldn't touch. It grew rapidly to displace Commerzbank in the Dax 30 – the index of Germany's 30 biggest quoted companies, and was celebrated in Germany as a rare local firm able to challenge Silicon Valley. But in June 2020, as it was attempting to buy Deutsche Bank (Germany's largest bank, with a market cap

⁹About \$1.8bn in 2020 dollars

of about \$20bn), Wirecard's auditors EY disclosed that a quarter of its claimed assets, some €2.1bn supposedly held in the Philippines, could not be found. (EY had failed to verify its bank statements with its bankers for three years, relying instead on 'screenshots' provided by the company itself [1838].) The firm filed for bankruptcy and its CEO, Markus Braun, was arrested. A string of fintech startups that used it to process payments stopped trading, leaving millions of cardholders inside and outside Germany unable to access their money. Yet investors and regulators had ignored numerous red flags, going back as far as 2008 [1258]. Worse, when the Financial Times published an analysis in 2019 of Wirecard's dubious accounting practices – pointing out that its Dubai subsidiary seemed to have no customers, that the address of one alleged Philippines subsidiary was a small bus company, that another was the home of a retired seaman, and that whistle blowers in its Singapore subsidiary had reported they were being ordered to cook the books [1285] – the German regulator BaFin had responded not by investigating the company but by starting a criminal investigation of the journalists and banning short selling of the company's shares [610]. BaFin had for some years defended the company against critics rather than investigating their criticisms. This was one of the largest frauds in European history, destroying over €20bn in apparent shareholder value, as well as public confidence in German financial regulation. En route Wirecard had taken in firms such as Moodys, Credit Suisse and Softbank. It was quite astonishing to see how little the lessons of McKesson and Robbins had been heeded; checking overseas cash balances really should have been audit 101. Yet the audit industry has persistent structural problems, ranging from the fact that auditors sell to CFOs to the fact that almost all the work is done by juniors [703].

12.2.6.4 Control tuning and corporate governance

The main reason internal control structures tend to be conservative, expensive and ineffective is that while in theory organizations develop them in the light of experience, in practice this experience is relayed through the auditor cartel. In theory there is some governance behind this. The most influential internal audit standard is the Risk Management Framework from the *Committee of Sponsoring Organizations (COSO)*, a group of US accounting and auditing bodies [462]. This is one yardstick by which your system will be judged if it's used in the US public sector or by companies quoted on US equity markets. The COSO model is targeted not just on internal control but on the reliability of financial reporting and compliance with laws and regulations. Its basic process is an evolutionary cycle: in a given environment, you assess the risks, design controls, monitor their performance, and then go round the loop again. COSO emphasizes soft aspects of corporate culture more than hard system design

issues, so it may be seen as a guide to managing and documenting the process by which your system evolves. In theory, its core consists of senior management checking that their control policies are being implemented and achieving their objectives, and modifying them if not. In practice, the auditors have captured it.

The Information Systems Audit and Control Association (ISACA), which administers the Certified Information Systems Auditor (CISA) exam, has a refinement of COSO known as the *Control Objectives for Information and related Technology* (CoBIT), which is more international [948]. It extends from the technical aspects of internal audit to personnel management, change control and project management. More concrete standards emerge from auditors' interpretation of specific sectoral regulations, such as Sarbanes-Oxley for US publicly-listed companies, Gramm-Leach-Bliley for US financial-sector firms, HIPAA for US healthcare providers and GDPR for the personal information of residents of EU member states. And, as we noted in the chapter on banking and bookkeeping, the standards set by the PCI trade association govern data relating to payment cards. There's also ISO 27001 on security management. Whatever sectors you or your customers operate in, it's worthwhile paying attention to evolving cybersecurity standards. Many of these are standards because everyone can agree on them, so they're by no means sufficient. Pretty well every big breach involves a firm with ISO 27001 certification; the auditors said something was OK when it wasn't. We'll return to this in section 28.2.9.

12.2.7 Finding the weak spots

If you are ever responsible for security in an organisation, you should not just think about which components might, by their failure, cause a bad enough loss to make a material difference to the bottom line. You need to think about the people too, and their external relationships. Which of your managers could defraud your company by colluding with customers or suppliers? Could a branch manager be lending money to a dodgy business run by his cousin against forged collateral? Could he have sold life-insurance policies to nonexistent people and forged their death certificates? Could an operations manager be taking bribes from a supplier? Could your call-centre staff be selling data from the accounts they've dealt with to a phishing gang who use this data to impersonate your company to your customers? Lots of things can go wrong. You have to figure out which of them matter, and how you get to find out. Remember the old experience of 1% of staff falling into temptation every year. Remember that a trusted person is one who can damage you. Who can damage you, and how? This is what a control maintainer must constantly think about.

The lessons to be learned include the following:

- Maintaining effective controls is hard in a changing environment and needs someone senior to own it.
- If you rely on complaints from customers or staff to alert you to fraud and system failures, you'd better have a good way for them to contact you and for you to listen to them. Many companies cut costs by being hard to contact, but this has consequences.
- The main exposure is to the company's own staff and contractors, so you'd better talk to enough of them and ask questions like 'If you wanted to defraud the company, how would you do it?'
- Don't just think in terms of transactions and processes, but about people, incentives, social norms and the power to manipulate or intimidate others. Do you expect people to keep each other honest without any motivating structure, and nothing but risk for whistle blowers?
- No security policy can achieve full compliance, as workarounds will be needed for people to cope with real life.
- These workarounds naturally create vulnerabilities, so you'd better design controls that people can comply with.
- You'd better have a working relationship with the firm's executive leadership, so you understand which of them might be incurring risks relevant to your responsibilities, and so they understand what you're doing too.

There will always be residual risks. Managing these residual risks remains one of the hardest and most neglected of jobs. It's an extremely bad idea to adopt a doctrine that some particular system is foolproof – because if you assign its failure an a priori probability of zero, then evidence won't shift it and things could go badly wrong when it eventually fails. More generally, you need to help the firm learn from experience. And experience means not just loss history: controls that get in the way need to be identified and improved. If you're seen as contributing to profits rather than just as another compliance burden, you'll be listened to a lot more. For example, if you can fix the password reset function so it needs fewer staff, or improve the fraud engine so that the company's website rejects fewer shopping baskets, the board will listen to you a lot more readily.

Finally, your risk management systems will have to pay some homage to one or more compliance regimes, depending on the industry. The international standard ISO 27001 on security management is used in some industries: it demands that you analyse the risks systematically and subject the unacceptable ones to some form of risk treatment (control, avoidance, transfer); and

have a management process to ensure that the controls are updated. In many companies, this will be driven by your auditors anyway. And there are many sector-specific regulatory regimes to deal with. In healthcare you have to worry about HIPAA (see section 10.4); and as for banking and payments, we turn to that next.

12.3 Interbank payment systems

When people think of electronic fraud, they often envisage a Hollywood scene in which crafty Russian hackers break a bank's codes and send zillion-dollar wire transfers to tax havens. Systems for transferring money are indeed a crime target, and have been for a century and a half. We'll look first at the systems used to transfer money between banks, and then at those used by bank customers, whether individuals or merchants.

12.3.1 A telegraphic history of E-commerce

Many people assume that e-commerce is something invented in the mid-1990s. But it goes back much further.

Governments used visual signalling from classical times, including heliographs (which used mirrors to flash sunlight at the receiver), semaphores (which used the positions of moving arms to signal letters and numbers) and flags. Land-based systems sent messages along chains of beacon towers, and naval systems relayed them between ships. After the Napoleonic War, the French government opened its heliograph network to commercial use, and soon the first frauds took place. For two years up till they were discovered in 1836, two bankers bribed an operator to signal the movements of the stock market to them covertly by making errors in transmissions that they could observe from a safe distance. Other techniques were devised to signal the results of horse races. Bookies learned to 'call time' by a clock, rather than waiting for a result and hoping that they were the first to hear it.

From the 1760s to the 1840s, the electric telegraph was developed by a number of pioneers, of whom the most influential was Samuel Morse. He persuaded Congress in 1842 to fund an experimental line from Washington to Baltimore. This so impressed people that serious commercial investment started, and by the end of that decade there were 12,000 miles of line operated by 20 companies. This was in many ways like the Internet boom of the late 1990s.

Banks were the first big users, and found that they needed mechanisms to prevent transactions being altered by crooked operators en route: I discussed the *test key* systems they developed for the purpose in section 5.2.4. Telegrams

were also used to create national markets. For the first time, commodity traders in New York could find out within minutes what prices had been set in auctions in Chicago, and fishing skippers arriving in Boston could find out the price of cod in Gloucester. The history of the period shows that most of the concepts and problems of e-commerce were familiar to the Victorians [1821]. How do you know who you're speaking to? How do you know if they're trustworthy? How do you know whether the goods will be delivered, and whether payments will arrive? The nineteenth-century answer was trusted intermediaries – principally banks who helped business manage risk using references, guarantees and letters of credit.

By the 1970s, bankers started to realise that this worthy old Victorian system was due for an overhaul.

First, as I noted earlier in section 5.2.4, most test-key systems were vulnerable to cryptanalysis; someone who observed a number of transactions could gradually work out the key material.

Second, the test key system didn't support dual control. The secret tables were kept in a safe, and two clerks would sit together to work out a test and check it; but there was nothing really to stop staff members working out tests for unauthorised messages at the same time.

Third, the real concern was cost and errors. The use of manual cryptography meant that each transaction was typed on a keyboard at least three times: once into the paying bank's computer, which would print out a transaction in the telex room, where a test was computed manually; then a second time to send a telex to the receiving bank, who would check the test manually; then the third time as that bank fed it into their own computer. Errors were much more of a problem than frauds. Surely the payments could flow directly from one bank's computer to another?

12.3.2 SWIFT

A consortium of banks set up the Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunications (SWIFT) in the 1970s to provide a more secure, efficient and controllable mechanism for sending payment instructions between member banks. It can be thought of as an email system with built-in authentication and non-repudiation services, plus optional encryption. It's used to ship trillions of dollars round the world daily, and its design has been copied in systems processing the title to many other kinds of asset, such as the bills of lading that prove ownership of ships' cargoes.

The design constraints are interesting. The banks did not wish to trust SWIFT to the point that its employees could forge bank transactions. The authenticity mechanisms had to be independent of the confidentiality mechanisms, since at the time a number of countries (such as France) forbade the civilian use of

cryptography for confidentiality. The non-repudiation functions could not use digital signatures, as they hadn't been invented yet. Finally, the banks had to be able to enforce auditable dual controls over interbank transactions.

The design of SWIFT I is summarized in Figure 12.2. Authenticity of messages was assured by computing a message authentication code (MAC) at the sending bank and checking it at the receiving bank. The keys used to be managed using *bilateral key exchange*: whenever a bank set up a relationship overseas, the senior manager who negotiated it would exchange keys with his opposite number, whether in a face-to-face meeting or afterwards by post to each others' home addresses. There were two key components to minimize the risk of compromise, with one sent in each direction (even if a bank manager's mail is read in his mailbox by a criminal at one end, it's not likely to happen at both). Authentication was not enabled until both banks confirmed that the other's key had been safely received and installed.




Figure 12.2: Architecture of SWIFT

This way, SWIFT had no part in the message authentication; so long as the authentication algorithm in use was sound, none of their staff could forge a transaction. The authentication algorithm was supposed to be a trade secret, but as banks like their security mechanisms to be international standards, people figured out to look at ISO 8731 [1634]. Pretty quickly, an attack was found and published in [1548]. Fortunately, this attack takes over 100,000 messages to recover a key – which was too large for a practical attack on a closed system and gave the banks time to migrate to more modern mechanisms.

Although SWIFT itself was not trusted for authentication, it did provide a non-repudiation service. Banks in each country sent their messages to a *Regional General Processor (RGP)*, which logged them and forwarded them to SWIFT, which also logged them and sent them on to the recipient via the RGP in its country, which also logged them. The RGPs were generally run by different service firms. Thus, any banker wishing to dishonestly repudiate a

transaction would have to subvert not just the local SWIFT application and its surrounding controls, but two independent contractors in different countries. And logs are easier for judges to understand than cryptography.

Confidentiality was an optional add-on. It was provided by line encryption devices between the banks and the RGP node, and between these nodes and the main SWIFT processing sites. Keys were hand-carried between the devices at either end of a leased line. In countries where confidentiality was illegal, these devices could be omitted without impairing the authenticity and non-repudiation mechanisms¹⁰.

Dual control was provided either by specialized terminals or by software packages that could be integrated with other bank systems. The usual method of operation is to have three separate staff to do a SWIFT transaction: one to enter it, one to check it, and one to authorize it¹¹. There's a further functional control in that you reconcile accounts by checking transactions against statements every day. So a bogus payment instruction that gets past the entry controls should result in an alarm the following business day.

12.3.3 What goes wrong

SWIFT I ran for twenty years without a single report of external fraud against the system itself. In the mid 1990s, after the attack on the MAC algorithm was published, it was enhanced by adding public key mechanisms: SWIFT II still used bilateral key exchange, but with MAC keys shared between correspondent banks using public-key cryptography and the MACs themselves further protected by a digital signature. The key-management mechanisms were ensconced as ISO 11166, and there was some debate over the security of this architecture [113, 1634]. Quite apart from the centralization of trust brought about by the adoption of public key cryptography – in that a central certification authority could falsely certify a key as belonging to a bank when it doesn't – at least one early deployment adopted 512-bit public keys because of US export controls, and by 2000 at least one RSA public key of this length had been factored surreptitiously by a group of students [44]. Bilateral key exchange was replaced in 2009 with a new system whose cryptographic mechanisms are proprietary. The messaging standard is being replaced by ISO 20022.

A political row arose once the crypto started to be toughened up and to offer confidentiality by default. The New York Times disclosed in June 2006

¹⁰In one country, a bank that attempted to install line encryptors found noise appearing on the line after a few hours. This only appeared on the live line, not the backup one, only after a delay, and swapping the equipment between the two lines didn't help. The bank realised that the local secret police wouldn't tolerate encryption and gave up.

¹¹As the checker can modify the payee and the amount, this is really only dual control, not triple control – and the programmers who maintain the interface can always attack the system there, unless you can maintain separation of duty on the systems side too.

that the NSA was accessing the entire transaction stream, whereupon the NSA simply demanded access to everything. This caused a confrontation with privacy-conscious Europeans, but eventually after President Obama succeeded President Bush, the EU agreed a treaty under which the US Treasury Department can serve subpoenas on SWIFT [343]. Payments within Europe were supposedly excluded, but since Ed Snowden revealed the scale of collection of such payments, the issue has been raised repeatedly by the European Parliament and by privacy authorities¹².

Criminal (as opposed to governmental) attacks on interbank systems have not involved the payment mechanisms themselves but the surrounding business processes. It does happen from time to time that a bank programmer inserts a bogus message into the processing queue, but it usually fails because he doesn't understand the business process. How an international wire transfer actually works is that banks maintain accounts with each other, so when bank A sends money to a customer of bank B, it actually sends an instruction 'please pay this customer the following sum out of our account with you'. As these accounts have both balances and credit limits, and as payments may have to go through one or more correspondent banks, large payments need human interventions to make the money available. There are also filters that look for large transactions so that the bank can report them to the money-laundering authorities [76]. So a naive programmer who sneaks in a bogus transaction to an account he's set up at a Swiss bank usually gets arrested when he turns up to collect the cash.

The most famous attack carried out via SWIFT was in 4–5 February 2016 when North Korean agents stole \$63m from the Bank of Bangladesh. They appear to have used Dridex malware to steal the credentials of bank staff and then ordered four transactions that transferred \$81m from the bank's account at the Federal Reserve in New York to the Philippines, of which only \$18m was recovered; the rest got laundered through a local casino. A further 30 transactions for a total of \$851m were flagged for manual review by the Fed and not sent; another for \$20m was sent to Sri Lanka, but recovered after the paying bank noticed a spelling error and stopped payment. This was not actually an attack on SWIFT, but an attack on the Bank of Bangladesh's own gateway to the SWIFT system [859].

But if your life's goal is to get rich from bank fraud, you're probably better off getting a law degree and working as a bank manager rather than messing about with computers. In fact, most significant frauds have exploited procedural vulnerabilities rather than technical attacks.

¹²One might ask why banks don't just build new systems with end-to-end crypto, but bank regulators demand access to all message traffic between banks, and some traffic within banks, to enforce rules against insider trading.

- Perhaps the first famous wire fraud was in 1979 when Stanley Rifkin, a computer consultant, embezzled over ten million dollars from Security Pacific National Bank. He got round the controls by agreeing to buy a large shipment of diamonds from a Russian government agency in Switzerland. He observed an authorization code used internally when dictating transfers to the wire transfer department, and used it over the telephone – a classic example of dual control breakdown at a system interface. He gave himself extra time to escape by doing the deal just before a US bank holiday. Where he went wrong was in not planning what to do after he collected the stones. If he'd hidden them in Europe, gone back to the US and helped investigate the fraud, he might well have got away with it; as it was, he went on the run and got caught.
- A fraud of a slightly different type took place in 1986 between London and Johannesburg. At that time, the South African government operated two exchange rates, and in one bank the manager responsible for deciding which rate applied to each transaction conspired with a rich man in London. They sent money out to Johannesburg at an exchange rate of seven Rand to the Pound, and back again the following day at four. After two weeks of this, the central bank sent the police round. When he saw them in the dealing room, the manager fled without stopping to collect his jacket, drove over the border to Swaziland, and flew via Nairobi to London. There, he boasted to the press about how he had defrauded the wicked apartheid system. As the UK had no exchange controls, exchange control fraud wasn't an offence, so he couldn't be extradited. This is perhaps the only case I know where the perp not only got away with several million but also got to brag about it.
- I've seen bad guys getting away with fraud using a letter of guarantee. It's common enough for a company in one country to ask their bank to guarantee a loan to a company in another. This can be set up as a SWIFT message, or even a paper letter, between the two banks. But as no cash changes hands at the time, the balancing controls are inoperative. If a forged guarantee is accepted as genuine, the 'beneficiary' can take his time borrowing money from the accepting bank, laundering it, and disappearing. Only when the lending bank realises that the loan has gone sour and tries to call in the guarantee is the forgery discovered. Then you can end up with a computer forensics case as two banks argue over whose fault it was.

The lesson is to be alert to anything that can defeat dual control. But you need to see this in a broader context. It's not just the technical problems of systems administration, interfaces or even shared-control crypto: the core is the business process design. And quite often, critical transactions don't appear as such at a casual inspection. Proper split control usually needs functional

separation, and for that you need to really understand the application in its social and economic context.

12.4 Automatic teller machines

Our second set of lessons emerges from studying payment cards. This story has at least four components: first, *automatic teller machines* (ATMs); second, credit cards; third, the chip cards that have taken over as both debit and credit cards since the mid-2000s; and fourth, contactless payments including phone banking.

ATMs were one of the most influential technological innovations of the 20th century. They were devised in 1938 by the inventor Luther Simjian, who also thought up the teleprompter and the self-focusing camera. He persuaded Citicorp to install his 'Bankamat' machine in New York in 1939, but they withdrew it after six months, saying 'the only people using the machines were a small number of prostitutes and gamblers who didn't want to deal with tellers face to face' [1747]. Its comeback was in 1967, when a machine made by De La Rue was installed by Barclays Bank in Enfield, London. According to the World Bank, there are now over 2.4m machines, or 41 per 100,000 adults [2043]. Card payments with PINs are now used in many terminals in shops, and the technology, including block ciphers, tamper-resistant hardware and the supporting protocols, ended up being adapted for many other applications from postal franking machines to lottery ticket terminals. In short, ATMs were the 'killer app' that got modern commercial cryptology and retail payment technology off the ground.

12.4.1 ATM basics

Most ATMs operate using some variant of a system developed by IBM for its 3624 series cash machines in the late 1970s. The card's magnetic strip contains the customer's *primary account number* (PAN) and an expiry date. A secret key, called the 'PIN key', is used to encrypt the PAN, then decimalize it and truncate it. The result of this operation is called the 'natural PIN'; an offset can be added to give the PIN that the customer must enter. The offset has no cryptographic function; it just enables customers to choose their own PIN. An example of the process is shown in Figure 12.3.

In the first ATMs to use PINs, each ATM contained a copy of the PIN key, and each card contained the offset as well as the primary account number. So each ATM could verify all customer PINs. Early ATMs also operated offline; if your cash withdrawal limit was \$500 per week, a counter was kept on the card. From the mid-1990s, networks became more dependable, and ATMs have tended to

PAN:	8807012345691715
PIN key KP :	FEFEFEFEFEFEFEFE
Result of DES $\{PAN\}_{KP}$:	A2CE126C69AEC82D
$\{N\}_{KP}$ decimalized:	0224126269042823
Natural PIN:	0224
Offset:	6565
Customer PIN:	6789

Figure 12.3: IBM method for generating bank card PINs

operate online only, which simplified the design. Starting in 2003, magnetic strips were supplemented with smartcard chips, followed by contactless payment from 2012; I'll describe these enhancements in later sections. But the basic principle remains: PINs are generated and protected using cryptography.

A cryptographic processor, known as a *hardware security module* (HSM), is kept in the bank's server room and manages customer PINs so as to enforce a dual-control policy.

1. Operations on the clear values of customer PINs, and on the keys used to protect them, are always done in a *secure cryptographic device* (SCD), so that no member of the bank's staff ever gets to see a PIN other than their own. SCDs include the HSMs in the bank server room¹³ along with crypto modules in ATMs and other PIN-entry devices.
2. Thus, for example, the cards are personalized in a facility with machines to emboss the card, encode the mag strip and initialise the chip, while the PIN mailers are printed in a separate facility containing a printer attached to an HSM. They're mailed out a few days apart.
3. A *terminal master key* is supplied to each ATM in the form of two printed components, which are carried to the branch by separate people, input at the ATM's rear keyboard, and combined to form the key. Similar ceremonies (but with three people) are used to set up master keys between banks and network switches such as VISA.
4. If ATMs perform PIN verification locally, then the PIN key is encrypted under the terminal master key and sent to the ATM. Keys are stored in a local SCD – a tamper-resistant chip next to the keyboard – which either verifies PINs as they're entered or encrypts them so they can be sent from the ATM to a central HSM for checking.
5. If the bank's ATMs are to accept other banks' cards, then the PIN will be encrypted in the ATM's SCD and sent to the bank, which will

¹³Or nowadays, also in a cloud service provider or other service contractor

decrypt it and re-encrypt it using a key shared with the switch operator, such as VISA. This *PIN translation* function is done entirely within an HSM. VISA similarly uses an HSM to translate the PIN to a key shared with the card-issuing bank, so it can be verified by an HSM there.

The ATM network rapidly became orders of magnitude bigger than SWIFT. Rather than being used by a few thousand banks, it was soon connecting tens of thousands of banks and hundreds of millions of cardholders. It was not feasible to do either key exchange or financial settlement bilaterally between 20,000 banks, so each bank connects to a switch provided by a switching organization such as VISA, and these switches' HSMs translate the traffic. The switches also do accounting, so banks can settle their accounts for each day's transactions with a single debit or credit, rather than each having to maintain accounts with thousands of other institutions.

The switches are trusted, so if something goes wrong, there the consequences can be severe. This seems to happen about once a decade. In one case a switch manager ended up a fugitive from justice, and in another, a Y2K-related software upgrade at a switch was bungled, with the result that cardholders in one country found that for a day or two they could withdraw money even if their accounts were empty. The bill in each case was in seven figures.

The engineers who designed ATM networks and security systems in the 1980s (of whom I was one) assumed that criminals would be relatively sophisticated, fairly well-informed about the system design, and rational in their choice of attack methods. We worried about the many banks that were slow to buy security modules. We worried about banks cutting corners such as omitting authentication codes on authorization responses. We agonized over whether the encryption algorithms were strong enough, whether the tamper-resistant HSMs were tamper-resistant enough, and whether the random number generators used to generate keys were random enough. We knew we just couldn't enforce dual control properly: bank managers considered it beneath their dignity to touch a keyboard, so rather than entering the ATM master key components themselves after a maintenance visit, most of them would just give both key components to the ATM engineer. Above all, we worried that a repairman would get his hands on a bank's PIN key, force the reissue of millions of cards and wreck public confidence in electronic banking. This was our doomsday scenario.

Doomsday eventually happened. In December 2017, a key at Postbank in South Africa was compromised while kept on a laptop during a data centre move. Somehow, it was copied to a memory stick; the CEO also had a copy. The copies were supposed to be destroyed in front of witnesses but somehow a stick got lost. From March 2018 to December 2019, R56m (US \$3.4m) was stolen in 56,000 transactions, mostly from cards issued to poor pensioners to pay state

benefits. In February 2019, the central bank ordered Postbank to reissue all its 12m cards, which cost R1bn (US \$60m) [1239].

However, the millions of frauds against PIN-based payment cards over the past 50 years turned out to be very much more diverse.

12.4.2 What goes wrong

Card payment systems have huge transaction volumes, a wide diversity of operators, and plenty of capable motivated opponents. There have been successive waves of card fraud, where vulnerabilities were discovered, exploited and then eventually fixed. The overall pattern is that card fraud has increased in value over time but decreased as a proportion of the transactions; the system is slowly getting more secure as it grows in both size and experience [92].

The first wave, in the early 1990s, exploited the poor implementation and management of early magnetic-strip card systems. In the UK, one prolific fraudster, Andrew Stone, was convicted three times of ATM fraud, the last time getting five-and-a-half years in prison. He started when he discovered by chance an ‘encryption replacement’ trick: he changed the account number on his bank card to his wife’s and found that he could take money out of her account using his PIN. In fact, he could take money out of any account at that bank using his PIN. This happened because his bank wrote the encrypted PIN to the card’s magnetic strip without linking it to the account number. His second method was ‘shoulder surfing’: he’d stand in line behind a victim, observe the entered PIN, and pick up the discarded ATM slip. Most banks at the time printed the full account number on the slip, and a card would work with no other correct information on it.

Stone’s methods spread via people he trained as his accomplices, and via a ‘Howto’ manual he wrote in prison. Some two thousand victims of his (and other) frauds banded together to bring a class action against thirteen banks to get their money back. The banks beat this by arguing that the facts in each case were different, and split it into thousands of small-claims cases that the victims did not have the expertise to pursue. I was an expert in this case, and used it to write a couple of papers on what went wrong [55, 56]. The fraud eventually spread worldwide, as criminals in Romania and elsewhere started designing ATM skimming equipment and sold it online. Here I’ll summarize the more important and interesting lessons we learned.

Most of the actual ‘phantom withdrawals’ in the early 1990s appeared to have one of the following three causes:

- Simple processing errors give rise to a steady background noise of disputes. Developed countries get about four transactions per head per month; that’s 240m a month in the UK alone. If the error rate is only 1 in 100,000, that’s a lot of disputes. Even if your core banking system has

good balancing controls, the peripheral systems that feed it can be flaky. One source of errors we tracked down was that a large bank's ATMs would send a transaction again if the network went down before a confirmation message was received from the bank's server; periodically, the server itself crashed and forgot about open transactions, causing debits to be duplicated. We also found customers whose accounts were debited with other customers' transactions, and other customers who were never debited at all for their card transactions. (We used to call these cards 'directors' cards' and joked that they were issued to bank directors.)

- Thefts from the mail were reckoned in the 1990s to account for 30% of all UK payment card losses, and postal control procedures remained dismal for years. For example, when I moved to Cambridge in February 1992 my bank sent not one, but two, cards and PINs through the post, and they arrived only a few days after intruders had got hold of our apartment block's mail and torn it up looking for valuables. In 2003–5, when magnetic-strip cards were replaced with chip cards, there was another surge in thefts from the mail – see Figure 12.4. The main fix was to make you phone a call centre or visit a website to activate a card before you can use it.
- Frauds involving dishonest or negligent bank staff appeared to be the third big cause of phantoms. We've had occasional cases of ATM service staff installing wiretaps inside an ATM to record customer card and PIN data, and one case back in the 1990s of crooked insiders working out PINs for stolen cards for £50 a time. More recently we've had bigger cases of crooks working out how to social-engineer bank call centres to issue new cards to addresses they control [2017]. Insider frauds were particularly common in countries like Britain where the law generally made the customer pay for fraud, and rarer in countries like the US where the bank paid; British bank staff knew that customer complaints wouldn't be investigated carefully.

However, there were plenty of frauds due to careless design or that taught technical security lessons.

- The shoulder-surfing trick of standing in an ATM queue, observing a customer's PIN, picking up the discarded ticket and copying the data to a blank card, was first reported in New York in the mid-1980s; and it was still working in the Bay Area in the mid-1990s. By then it had been automated; Bay Area criminals used video cameras with motion sensors to snoop on PINs, whether by renting an apartment overlooking an ATM or even parking a rented van there. Visual copying is easy to stop: the standard nowadays is to print only the last four digits of the account number on the ticket, and since the early 1990s,

cards have a three-digit *card verification value* (CVV) on the magnetic strip that must never be printed. Yet the CVV is not always checked.

- There were many losses due to bugs and blunders. One ATM sold in the 1980s had a ‘test dispense’ code that would output ten banknotes of the lowest available denomination whenever a certain fourteen-digit sequence was entered at the keyboard. One bank printed this sequence in its branch manual, and three years later there was a sudden spate of losses. All the banks using the machine had to rush out a patch to disable the test dispense transaction. And despite the fact that I documented this in 1993, and again in the first edition of this book in 2001, similar incidents were still reported as late as 2007.
- Some makes of ATM used in convenience stores could be reprogrammed into thinking that they were dispensing \$1 bills when in fact they were dispensing twenties; it just took a default master password that was printed in the online manuals. Any passer-by who knew this could stroll up to the machine, reset the bill value, withdraw \$400, and have their account debited only \$20. The store owners who leased the machines were not told of the vulnerability, and were left to pick up the tab [1542].
- Many banks’ operational security procedures were dire. As an experiment, my wife went into a branch of our bank in 1993 with a witness and told them she’d forgotten her PIN. The teller helpfully printed her a new PIN mailer from a printer attached to a PC behind the counter – just like that! It was not the branch where our account is kept. Nobody knew her, and all the identification she offered was our bank card and her checkbook. When anyone who’s snatched a handbag can walk in off the street and get a PIN for the card in it at any branch, no amount of encryption technology will do much good. (That bank later went bust in 2008.)
- One technique that’s worked consistently for 40 years – and still works nowadays with many ATMs – is the *Lebanese loop*. The crook fits a loop of tape, perhaps from an old videocassette, into the ATM throat and waits for a victim. The card gets snagged in the loop, and the victim abandons it. The crook retrieves it, and if he managed to see the victim’s PIN, goes shopping. Some ATMs have mechanisms to frustrate this, and some don’t. Some banks just don’t care: one victim of such a fraud, in a bank lobby, went straight inside the bank to complain but was fobbed off by staff who didn’t want to get involved. After her card was looted, her card-issuing bank blamed her, and this ended up as a dispute.
- The high-tech modus operandi was using false terminals or skimmers to collect card and PIN data. The first report was from the USA in 1988; there, crooks built a vending machine that would accept any card and PIN, and dispense a pack of cigarettes. In

1993, two villains bought a real ATM and a software development kit for it, programmed it to steal card data and PINs, and installed it in the Buckland Hills Mall in Connecticut [990].

- False terminal attacks spread to Europe and to point-of-sale systems in the 90s. I mentioned in section 4.5, a tap on a garage point-of-sale terminal was used to harvest card and PIN data in Utrecht, in the Netherlands; and in 1994, crooks in London set up to a whole bogus bank branch [945]. Eventually, by the mid-2000s, card skimmers became widely available on the black market. By 2015 a Romanian gang was caught operating 100 ATMs in tourist spots in Mexico, stealing \$20m a month [1096]. Magnetic strip cards were just too easy to copy, and the card technology had to change.
- Since the mid-2010s, we have seen occasional ‘jackpotting’ attacks where crooks hack ATMs so that they keep on dispensing bills until they’re empty. This can involve infecting ATMs with malware, whether online or by getting physical access to a USB port, or physically inserting rogue electronics [485].
- There are occasional frauds when an insider gets at one of the servers in the back-end system, or when one of them fails insecure. This can result in customers being able to use cards with any PIN (if the online PIN checking process fails) or in customers with the right PIN being able to run up unlimited overdrafts (if the balance inquiry process fails). One such failure was deliberate: after 9/11 damaged its ATM network, the Municipal Credit Union decided to let customers in New York withdraw money without checking their balances until things could be fixed. That cost \$15m, and 118 customers ended up being charged with theft [1660].

I reckon the first thing we did wrong when designing ATM security systems in the 1980s was to worry about criminals being clever, when we should rather have worried about our customers – the banks’ system designers, implementers and testers – being unable to use the security systems we designed. In recent years, research by Yasemin Acar, Sascha Fahl and others has shown that many if not most security failures can be seen as programmer usability failures; normal programmers can’t cope with the complicated crypto APIs and access control mechanisms that security geeks love to build [11]. Security geeks pay attention to crypto because the maths are interesting, but less so to the ‘boring’ bits such as creating tools that non-specialists can actually use. So it’s rare that the bad guys have to break the crypto. And modern payment networks have so many users that we must expect the chance discovery of vulnerabilities that were too obscure to be caught in testing.

The second thing we did wrong was to not figure out what attacks could be industrialised, and focus on those. In the case of ATMs, the false-terminal attack

is the one that eventually made the big time. The first hint of organised crime involvement was in 1999 in Canada, where dozens of alleged Eastern European organized-crime figures were arrested in the Toronto area for deploying doctored point-of-sale terminals [130, 217]. Since about 2005, skimmers made in Eastern Europe are sold on underground markets, designed to be attached to the throats of cash machines to read the magnetic strip and also capture the PIN using a tiny camera or a keyboard overlay. I'll discuss these in more detail in the next section. The remedy has been moving from magnetic-strip cards to chip cards, but this has taken over fifteen years, and magnetic-strip fraud has cost a lot of money in the meantime. The curious thing may be that it took 40 years from the launch of magnetic-strip ATM cards until skimmers made them too easy to attack. The key factor was that criminals started to specialise and organise, as I discussed in section 2.3.

12.4.3 Incentives and injustices

In the US, the banks carry a lot of the risks associated with new technology. In a historic case, *Judd v Citibank*, bank customer Dorothy Judd claimed that she had not made some disputed withdrawals, and Citibank said that as its systems were secure, she must have done. The judge ruled that he “was not prepared to go so far as to rule that when a credible witness is faced with the adverse ‘testimony’ of a machine, he is as a matter of law also faced with an unmeetable burden of proof” – and gave her her money back [997]. The US Federal Reserve incorporated this view into ‘Regulation E’, which requires banks to refund all disputed transactions unless they can prove fraud by the customer [639]. This has led to some minor abuse, but typically less than the losses from vandalism [2048].

In other countries – such as the UK, the Netherlands and Norway – the banks got away for years with claiming that their ATM systems were infallible. Phantom withdrawals, they maintained, could not happen, and a customer who complained of one must be mistaken or lying. This position was somewhat undermined in the UK when Stone and his followers started being jailed for ATM fraud, and there were some rather unpleasant incidents. One example was the Munden case [56].

John Munden was one of our local police constables, based in Bottisham, Cambridgeshire; his beat included the village of Lode where I lived at the time. He came home from holiday in September 1992 to find his account at the Halifax Building Society empty. He asked for a statement, found six withdrawals for a total of £460 that he did not recall making, and complained. The Halifax had him prosecuted for attempting to obtain money by deception. It came out during the trial that their IT was somewhat ramshackle; the disputed transactions had not been properly investigated; and they made all sorts of wild

claims, such as that their ATM system couldn't suffer from bugs as its software was written in assembler. Nonetheless, it was his word against theirs. He was convicted in February 1994 and suspended from the police force. Just before the appeal was due to be heard, the prosecution served up a report from the Halifax's auditors claiming that their system was secure. The defense demanded equal access to the bank's systems for its own expert. The Halifax refused, so the court disallowed all its computer evidence. The case collapsed, John Munden was acquitted, and he got his job back.

Once the fuss died down, the banks went back to claiming that their systems were secure, and the same drama played itself out again when Jane Badger, of Burton-on-Trent, England, was prosecuted for complaining about phantom withdrawals. The case against her collapsed in January 2008. If a system is to provide evidence, then dual control is not enough. It must be able to withstand examination by hostile experts. The security property the bank really needed wasn't dual control but *non-repudiation*: the ability for the principals in a transaction to prove afterwards what happened. This might have been provided by installing ATM cameras; although these were mandatory in the state of New York as an anti-mugging measure, they were not used in Britain. Indeed, during the 1992–4 wave of ATM frauds, the few banks who had installed ATM cameras were pressured by the other banks into withdrawing them; camera evidence was a threat to the banks' collective stance that their systems were infallible. It would be a further 25 years before the Post Office case I mentioned in section 12.2.6.1 would finally expose a bank's systems to thorough scrutiny, and have them condemned as unreliable in the High Court.

12.5 Credit cards

The second component that led to modern card payment systems was the credit card. For years after their invention by Diners Club in the 1950s, credit cards were treated by most banks as a loss leader with which to attract high-value customers. Eventually, the number of merchants and cardholders reached critical mass and the transaction volume took off. In Britain, from the mid-80s, the credit card business was suddenly extremely profitable¹⁴.

When you use a credit card to pay for a purchase in a store, the transaction flows from the merchant to their bank (the *acquiring bank*), which pays them after deducting a *merchant discount* of typically just under 2% for a small merchant¹⁵. If the card was issued by a different bank, the transaction now flows

¹⁴Payment systems have strong network externalities, just like communications technologies or computer platforms: the service provider must recruit enough merchants to appeal to cardholders, and vice versa, so new payment mechanisms can take years to get established, then suddenly take off like a rocket.

¹⁵Debit cards are cheaper, and big merchants can pay under 1% even for credit card transactions.

to a switch such as VISA, which passes it to the *issuing bank* for payment. Each transaction involves two components: *authorisation*, when you present your card at a merchant and they want to know right now whether to give you the goods, and *settlement*, which flows through a separate system and gets money to the merchant, often two or three days later. The issuer also gets a slice of the merchant discount, but makes most of its money from extending credit to cardholders.

12.5.1 Credit card fraud

From the 1950s to the 1990s, credit card transactions were processed by making a paper sales draft on a multipart form using the embossing on the card, writing in the amount, getting the customer to sign it, and processing it like a check. The risk of fraud using stolen credit cards was traditionally managed by *hot card lists* and merchant *floor limits*. Each merchant got a local 'hot card list' plus a limit set by their acquiring bank above which they have to call for online authorization. In the 1980s, electronic terminals were introduced so a sales clerk could swipe a card and get an authorization automatically. The crooks' response was a flood of forged cards: between 1989 and 1992, magnetic strip counterfeiting grew from an occasional nuisance into half the total fraud losses [12].

The introduction of mail-order and telephone sales led to *card not present* (CNP) transactions where the merchant was not able to inspect the card. Banks managed the risk by using the expiry date as a password, lowering the floor limits, increasing the merchant discount and insisting on delivery to a cardholder address, of which the numerical part is supposed to be checked during authorization. But the main change was to shift liability so that the merchant bore the risk of disputes. If you challenge an online credit card transaction (or in fact any transaction made under CNP rules), the full amount is immediately debited back to the merchant, together with a significant handling fee. This applies whether the debit is a fraud, a dispute or a return.

VISA's response to growing card forgery and online fraud was *card verification values* (CVVs) – three-digit MACs computed on the card strip contents (account number, version number, expiry date) and written at the end of the strip. They worked: in the first quarter of 1994, VISA's fraud losses dropped by 15.5%, while Mastercard's rose 67% [388]. So Mastercard adopted CVVs too. They also appeared on debit cards, which converged with credit cards technically: this was an extended process as banks first allowed credit cards to be used in ATMs too and then let debit cards be used at the point of sale, at different times in different countries.

The crooks moved to *skimming* – operating businesses where genuine customer cards were swiped through an extra, unauthorized, terminal to grab

a copy of the magnetic strip, which would then be re-encoded on a genuine card. (In countries where PINs were already used in point-of-sale terminals, this allowed forged cards to be used in ATMs directly.) The banks' response was intrusion detection systems that tried to identify criminal businesses by correlating the purchase histories of customers who complained. By the late 1990s, the smarter crooked businesses learned to absorb the cost of the customer's transaction. You have a drink at a Mafia-owned bistro, offer a card, sign the voucher, and fail to notice when the charge doesn't appear on your bill. A month or two later, there's a huge bill for jewelry, electrical goods or even casino chips. By then you've forgotten about the bistro, and the bank never had a record of it [720].

In the early 2000s, high-tech criminals became better organised as electronic crime became specialised. The emergence of online criminal forums, starting in Russia and Ukraine in 2003, enabled malware writers, botnet herders, phishing site operators and cash-out specialists to trade with each other and get good at their jobs. This spilled over from targeting online transactions to attacks on retail terminals. Forums offered fake terminals and skimmers that record mag-strip card and PIN data, so as to make card clones. In the Far East, wiretaps were used to harvest card data from the mid-2000s [1160].

Europe introduced smartcards in 2003–5, and the crooks came up with devices that copy data from chip cards to mag-strip cards for use in terminals that still accepted mag-strip transactions. Some of them used vulnerabilities in the EMV protocol, and so I'll come back to them after I've described EMV and chip cards in the next section.

Regardless of whether the card has a chip or not, there are many scams involving cards that are never received by genuine customers. There's *pre-issue fraud* including thefts from the mail of the 'pre-approved' cards that arrive in junk mail. There are applications made in the names of people who exist but are not aware of the application (often misrepresented as 'identity theft' by banks that would like to pretend that it was your identity that was stolen rather than their money [1326]). And there are scams where crooks get careless bank staff to send a replacement card for your account to an address they control [2017]. The remaining line of defence against such scams – until the customer gets a bill and complains – is automatic fraud detection, which I'll discuss in section 12.5.4.

12.5.2 Online card fraud

Turning now from traditional credit card fraud to the online variety, I first helped the police investigate an online credit card fraud in 1987. In that case, the suspect got a list of hot credit card numbers from his partner who worked in a supermarket, and used them to buy software from companies overseas,

which he downloaded to order for his customers. Hot card lists at the time carried only those cards that were being abused in that country; using a local hot card overseas meant that the bank would carry the can, not an innocent customer. As it happens, the suspect quit before there was enough evidence to arrest him. A rainstorm washed away the riverbank opposite his house and exposed a hide the police had built to stake him out.

From about 1995, the dotcom boom got underway, and businesses rushed to build websites. There was anxiety that the use of credit cards on the Internet would lead to an avalanche of fraud, as ‘evil hackers’ intercepted emails and web forms and harvested credit card numbers by the million. These fears drove Microsoft and Netscape to introduce SSL/TLS to encrypt credit card transactions en route from browsers to web servers.

The reality is a bit more complex. Intercepting email and web traffic is indeed possible, especially at endpoints, but can be difficult to do at scale. Lots of websites ran for many years with no encryption, or weak encryption, and the real issue turned out to be not wiretapping but phishing. Even this only got going at scale after 2004; and there (as I remarked in Chapter 3) the issue is more psychology than cryptography. TLS per se doesn’t help, as bad guys who can set up man-in-the-middle attacks can just get certificates and encrypt the traffic. The site will have a different domain name, but it’s unreasonable to expect most members of the public to notice that, especially as banks and merchants use all sorts of variant domains themselves¹⁶.

Second, most of the credit card numbers that are traded online got into bad hands because someone hacked a merchant’s computer. VISA had rules for years that prohibited merchants from storing credit card data once the transaction had been processed, but many merchants ignored them. There followed the *Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard* (PCI-DSS), a joint effort by the Payment Card Industry Security Standards Council¹⁷. PCI DSS rules require basic hygiene for systems holding cardholder data such as account numbers and expiry dates¹⁸ while sensitive data such as CVVs and PINs can’t be stored at all. Finally, enforcement started to bite, and by in October 2007, the US National Retail Federation asked credit card companies to stop forcing retailers to store credit card data at all (they were supposed to store card numbers temporarily in case of chargebacks) [1961]. PCI DSS has now become a significant piece of compliance for firms that accept credit card

¹⁶There are now some technical fixes, such as certificate transparency, which I’ll discuss in section 21.5.1.

¹⁷This was set up by VISA, Mastercard, Amex, JCB and Discover; it now has other stakeholders too.

¹⁸Cardholder data must be encrypted when they go over networks, and when stored, they must be protected by a firewall and AV; default passwords can’t be used; and you must have a security policy, need-to-know access controls, testing, and since 2017 a secure software development lifecycle. It adds up to quite a bundle of documentation and a lot of jobs for accountants to check it.

transactions; it provides little liability cover, since if fraud happens the banks can usually blame the merchant anyway even if it was certified compliant.

Other real incentives facing merchants are, first, the cost of disputes, and second, security-breach disclosure laws. While the details differ between countries, disclosure laws have made a difference as notifying customers costs real money and the stock prices of companies suffering a breach can fall several percent. As for disputes, consumer protection laws in many countries make it easy to repudiate a transaction. Basically all the customer has to do is call the credit card company and say “I didn’t authorize that” and the merchant is saddled with the bill. This was workable in the days when almost all credit card transactions took place locally and most were for significant amounts. If a customer fraudulently repudiated a transaction, the merchant would pursue them through the courts. Nowadays many transactions are international, amounts are small, and verifying overseas addresses via the credit card system is flaky. So the opportunity for repudiating transactions – and getting away with it – is increased.

On the other hand, some market sectors have many websites that exploit their customers, and porn sites have been a running sore. A common scam was to offer a ‘free tour’ of the site and demand a credit card number, supposedly to verify that the user was over 18, and then bill him anyway. Some sites billed other consumers who have never visited them at all [923]. Even apparently large and ‘respectable’ web sites like `playboy.com` were criticised for such practices, and at the bottom end of the porn industry, things are atrocious. The worst case so far was probably Operation Ore, in which some three thousand victims of credit card fraud were wrongly arrested on suspicion of buying child sex abuse material, and at least one killed himself. I discuss the Operation Ore case in section 26.5.3.

The main brake on wicked websites is the credit-card chargeback. A bank will typically charge the merchant \$100–200 in fees for each of them, as well as debiting the transaction amount from his account. So if more than a small percentage of the transactions on your site are challenged by customers, your margins will be eroded. If chargebacks go over perhaps 10%, your bank may terminate your service. This has motivated merchants to take care – to beware of odd orders (e.g., for four watches), orders from dodgy countries, customers using free email services, requests for expedited delivery, and so on. But leaving the bulk of the liability for mail-order transactions with them is suboptimal: the banks know much more about fraud patterns. Shared liability might well be better, but legal systems are not good at that. One lobbyist beats another when the law gets written, or one legal team beats the other when the key precedent is set, and we get stuck with it.

One systematic attack involves progressive guessing. All websites must ask for the primary account number and expiry date, but a merchant may also ask

for the CVV printed on the back of the card, and digits from the cardholder address. Starting from a valid account number, you guess the expiry date by testing it on merchant websites that check only that; then you guess the CVV on websites that check that too, then the postcode digits, and finally guess the house number from the websites that check that too. There are enough websites out there for this to work for VISA cards; Mastercard has central monitoring, and they hot-list a number after about ten failed guesses (though this can lead to denial-of-service attacks) [1].

Another attack is *credential stuffing*, where the bad guys get millions of email/password combinations from compromised websites and try them out in other sites from which value can be extracted. Such attacks, plus the increasing availability of stolen credit card data on underground markets, have driven the development of better cardholder authentication, at least for larger transactions.

12.5.3 3DS

3D Secure is a single sign-on system designed by the payment card industry¹⁹. When the merchant captures a payment transaction past some threshold, they redirect to a bank server that invites the customer to authenticate the transaction using a password or a second-factor such as a code sent to their mobile by SMS. It is increasingly used for large payment card transactions.

3DS acquired users rapidly because customers who used it were held liable for fraud where possible, so merchants paid less. Customer onboarding was a soft spot for years. Many banks initially let the 3DS servers enrol their customers directly and solicit a password the first time their card was used at a participating merchant, a process called *activation during shopping* (ADS). Some even let customers re-enrol if they forgot the password, so initially the system was easy to hack. It also got customers used to entering bank passwords at a site whose URL has nothing to do with the bank, and one bank even got customers to enter their ATM PINs there [1364]. Now, a decade after its initial roll-out, 3DS is moving to an (incompatible) second version endorsed as an EMV standard. A factor has been government mandates to use two-factor authentication, which results in most banks knowing their customers' mobile phone numbers. However, SMS-based two-factor authentication is now reaching the end of its useful life, as discussed previously in section 3.4.1 and later in section 12.7.4. Some 3DS implementations still use bank passwords.

¹⁹It is variously branded as 'Mastercard SecureCode', 'Verified by VISA', 'Amex SafeKey' and 'Discover ProtectBuy'.

12.5.4 Fraud engines

People started working from the mid-1990s on better financial intrusion detection, and by now all websites of any size that accept card-not-present transactions have a fraud engine that decides whether to accept or decline each transaction. There are two approaches: anomaly detection, which uses various thresholding and other techniques to look for unusual patterns, and abuse detection, which looks for known fraud patterns. The big problem in both cases is false positives. We all have experience of cards being blocked, and in many cases the triggers are obvious. Small transactions used to cause alarms as they suggested a thief testing stolen cards to see which are still live. Another issue was multiple transactions overseas; in the 1990s, whenever I went to the US, my debit card would do three transactions and then stop working. Modern machine-learning techniques have made such mechanisms slightly less annoying, but the sheer scale of modern payment systems with tens of thousands of transactions per second means that even a 0.1% false positive rate will create a firehose of customer complaints.

More convincing are projects that look for known patterns of misuse. For example, FICO maintains a list of the most suspicious ATMs. Banks that subscribe to its service tell it whenever a transaction is declined, whether because of a stolen card, a wrong PIN or an empty account. The ATM is then bumped up the 'hot ATM' list. When a crook takes a fistful of stolen cards to an ATM, it will get to the top of the list within three or four cards and then decline any card issued by a bank that subscribes to FICO's service. The crook will assume they're no good and throw them away. Over 40% of the world's banks, by card issuing volume, now subscribe.

An important success factor in running an intrusion detection system is the incentives. Websites in the UK can turn away as much as 4% of offered shopping baskets because of their fraud engines. If security is the responsibility of the CFO, he'll see it as a cost centre and try to minimise it; but for the chief marketing officer, a 25% improvement in the false positive rate translates to '1% more sales', for which they'll happily pay real money.

The core of a good fraud engine tends to be several dozen signals extracted from the transaction stream on the basis of a set of well-understood threat vectors (such as bad IP addresses, or too many logons from the same IP address) and a set of quality signals (such as 'card old but good'). These signals are then fed to a machine-learning system that scores the transactions. The signals appear to be the most important part of the design, not whether you use an SVM or a Bayesian network. The signals need to be continuously curated and updated as the bad guys learn new tricks, and the fraud engine needs to be well integrated with the human processes. As for how fraud engines fail, the regulator's report into a 2016 fraud against Tesco Bank found that the staff failed to 'exercise due skill, care and diligence' over the fraud detection rules,

and to ‘respond to the attack with sufficient rigor, skill and urgency’ [687]. In that case, the bank failed to update its fraud engine following a warning from Mastercard the previous day of a new type of card scam. We’ll discuss this case further in section 12.6.3 once we’ve explained chip cards.

12.6 EMV payment cards

The biggest investment since 2003 has been in new card technologies, with banks replacing both credit cards and debit cards with EMV smartcards, followed by contactless payments with both cards and phones. Card payments have become both complex and diverse; the best way to understand them may be to follow their evolution.

When integrated circuits came along in the 1960s and microprocessors in the 1970s, various people proposed putting them in bank cards. The Germans consider the smartcard to have been invented by Helmut Gröttrup and Jürgen Dethloff in 1968, when they proposed and patented a custom IC for a card; the Japanese point to a patent by Kunitaka Arimura in 1970; while the French credit Roland Moreno, who proposed memory chips in cards in 1973, and Michel Ugon who proposed adding a microprocessor in 1977. The French company Honeywell-Bull patented a chip containing memory, a microcontroller and everything else needed to do transactions in 1982; they started being used in French pay phones in 1983, and in banking from the mid-1980s.

Norway was second with some banks issuing chip cards from 1986. Britain’s NatWest Bank developed the Mondex electronic purse system in the early 90s, piloted it in Swindon, then sold it to Mastercard; the software evolved into Multos, a card operating system that’s still in use. There was a patent fight between VISA and Mastercard. There is more detail on these early pilot projects in Chapter 3 of the second edition of this book. That was all good learning experience. But for a payment card to be really useful, it has to work internationally – and especially in Europe with many small countries jammed up close together, where millions of people cross borders for their weekly shop or even on their commute to work. So the banks finally got together in the late 1990s and hammered out a standard.

12.6.1 Chip cards

The EMV standards specify chip cards and the supporting protocols for use in ATMs and retail payment terminals. They were initially developed by Europay, Mastercard and VISA, who then set up EMVCo to maintain and extend the standards. Chip cards were rolled out in the UK from 2003–6 and then in other

European countries, most of which use PINs for authentication in stores as well as ATMs, leading to the system being called ‘chip and PIN’. In the US and Singapore, chip cards are now used with signatures, and the system’s called ‘chip and signature’. The standards run to many thousands of pages; they now extend to contactless payments, online payments and much else; and there are further documents specific to particular countries, and to individual banks. To make sense of it all, let’s start with the basic protocol for using an EMV card with a PIN to buy goods from a shop.

First, the card sends its credentials to the *PIN entry device* (PED) or terminal, consisting of the primary account number (PAN) and a certificate signed by the card issuing bank. Then the terminal sends an *unpredictable number* or nonce N , the date t and the requested payment amount X , along with the PIN entered by the cardholder. The card checks the PIN, and if it’s correct, it computes an *authentication request cryptogram* (ARQC), which is a message authentication code (MAC) on N , d_3 and X . Each message has some extra data d_i which we’ll discuss later.

$$\begin{aligned} C \rightarrow T &: \text{PAN}, d_1, \text{Cert}_{KB}(\text{PAN}, d_1) \\ T \rightarrow C &: N, t, X, d_2, \text{PIN} \\ C \rightarrow T &: d_3, \text{MAC}_{KCB}(d_3, T, N, t, X) \end{aligned}$$

The ARQC is computed using a key KCB shared between the card and the bank²⁰. The merchant can’t check this, so must either accept the risk of an offline payment or send the transaction to the card-issuing bank through the payment network. The bank checks the ARQC and the available funds, and if all’s well sends a response that also includes an *authorisation response cryptogram* (ARPC) for the card. The card responds with a further MAC called the *transaction certificate*.

EMV allows many options, some of which are dangerous, either individually or in combination, and can be thought of as a construction kit for building payment systems, with which you can build systems that are quite secure, or very insecure. It’s the switch specifications from VISA and Mastercard that really constrain the crypto as most banks want to be able to rely on their stand-in processing. Things got tightened up steadily over 2005–17 as a succession of frauds exploited the less secure versions. The simplest way to understand the protocol suite may be to follow this history.

12.6.1.1 Static data authentication

The default EMV variant up till 2011 in many countries was *static data authentication* (SDA). As this used cheap cards that could not do public-key

²⁰The long-term key KCB is actually used to generate a *derived unique key per transaction* (DUKPT, pronounced duck-put) as a countermeasure to power analysis. I’m omitting such details here and will discuss power analysis later in the chapter on side channels.

cryptography, there's no card public key K_C , and the PIN is sent to the card in the clear. So it's still vulnerable to sniffing by a man-in-the-middle device, just as with the magnetic strip cards that EMV was replacing. The terminal verifies the certificate and digital signature, but has no way to verify the MAC²¹. As before, merchants have a floor limit below which offline transactions are permitted, so they don't have to stop trading when the network or the acquiring bank are down²².

To begin with, the commonly-exploited vulnerability was backwards compatibility with magnetic strip cards. The certificate initially contained all the information needed to forge a mag-strip card, and as the introduction of chip and PIN meant that people started to enter PINs everywhere rather than just at cash machines²³, gangs either set up false terminals or used various wire-tap devices to collect card data from genuine terminals and then cashed out via mag-strip forgeries. Initially these were used in local ATMs that would fall back to mag-strip processing for reliability and compatibility during the changeover. From the late 2000s, the crooks targeted countries such as the USA and Thailand that hadn't adopted EMV yet. This wave of mag-strip fallback fraud is visible in the counterfeit line in Figure 12.4, which surges between 2006 and 2010.




Figure 12.4: Card fraud in the UK from 2004 to 2018

²¹The bank could thus use any algorithm it liked, but the default was DES-CBC-MAC with triple-DES for the last block.

²²Floor limits were first cut to zero in Spain, and this seems to be happening in the UK too, which seems daft; stations should not stop selling tickets when the phone line goes down, except possibly for season tickets.

²³In the UK, at 900,000 shop terminals as well as 50,000 ATMs.

Part of the crime wave of 2006–9 targeted petrol stations. An attack on our local BP garage in Cambridge involved a CCTV camera fitted in the ceiling to capture the PINs plus a wiretap to get the card data; over 200 local people found that copies of their cards were used in ATMs in Thailand. BP's competitor Shell was hit even harder, and fell back to mag-strip operation for a while after some of their PIN pads were replaced with tampered ones by crooks pretending to be maintenance engineers. The most spectacular fraud was discovered in 2008, when a gang apparently intercepted PIN entry devices in a warehouse in Dubai, en route from the factory in China to the UK and the Netherlands, and installed in them miniature mobile phones that sent the gang the card and PIN data. Shops in the UK and banks in the Netherlands installed new devices straight out of the box – which promptly started SMSing their customers' data to a server in Karachi [1732]. The gang was arrested and brought to trial in the UK, but the case failed when the banks declined to provide evidence.

Colleagues and I therefore investigated a sample of PIN pads and found that such attacks were easy. For example, the Ingenico i3300, the most widely-deployed terminal in the UK in 2007, had a user-accessible compartment, shown in Figure 12.5, which gives access to the bottom layer of the circuit board. We found that a 1 mm diameter via, carrying the serial data signal, was easily accessed using a bent paperclip, which could be inserted through a hole in the plastic without leaving any external marks. So an attacker could indeed hide a device inside the terminal that gathers and relays both card and PIN data. The 'Common Criteria Evaluation' of such devices turned out to be worthless; I will discuss the political and organisational reasons for its failure in section 28.2.7.2. Such devices are now certified to standards set by PCI, and the rising issue is software complexity; rather than being based on 8-bit microcontrollers, PIN entry devices nowadays tend to be built on Linux or Android platforms, which have a larger attack surface.

France was hit with a wave of attacks using 'yescards'. These are cards programmed to accept any PIN (hence the name) and to participate in the EMV protocol using a certificate from a genuine card, but returning random values for the MAC [180]. They worked just fine to buy low-value items like snacks and subway tickets, back when these were always sold via offline transactions.

Another family of problems has to do with authentication methods. Each card, and each terminal, has a priority list of preferred *cardholder verification methods* (CVMs), which it shares in the supplementary data d_1 and d_2 . The card might say in effect: 'first try online PIN verification, and if that's not supported, use local PIN verification, and if that's not possible then a signature will do, and if you can't even get that, then you don't need to authenticate the customer at all'. It might seem surprising that 'no authentication' is an option, but it's needed to support devices such as parking meters that don't have PIN pads. As well as PIN, signature or nothing, the terminal CVM list can specify authentication on a device, such as the biometric scanner on a phone. Both card and

terminal can have risk-management logic to set monetary limits for different methods. But EMV version 1 has a flaw: the list of authentication methods isn't itself authenticated, so a crook can manipulate it in a false-terminal attack [170].



Figure 12.5: A rigid wire is inserted through a hole in the Ingenico's concealed compartment wall to intercept the smartcard data. The front of the device is shown on the top right.

Many attacks become possible once you have a man-in-the-middle device. Two students of ours implemented a *relay attack* for a TV programme; a bogus terminal in a café was hooked up via radio to a bogus card. When a journalist in the café went to pay £5 for some cake to a till operated by one student, the transaction was relayed to the false card carried by the other, who was lingering in a bookstore waiting to buy a book for £50. The £50 transaction went through successfully [584]. There are many entertaining variants on the theme. We don't find them in the wild, though, as they're hard to scale.

The scale of fraud varies quite a lot between countries, and this teaches that the practical security of EMV depends on contextual factors and implementation details – such as the extent to which local ATMs will do fallback magnetic-strip processing, the proportion of local shops open to various kinds of skimmer attack, and – as always – incentives. Do the banks carry the can

for fraud as in the US, which makes them take care, or are they able to dump the costs on merchants and cardholders?

A landmark during EMV roll-out was the ‘liability shift’. In many countries, regulators allowed banks to arm-twist merchants into installing EMV terminals by changing their terms and conditions so that merchants were liable for disputed transactions if EMV wasn’t used, but the banks became liable if it was. In that case, banks in much of Europe simply blamed the customer: ‘Your card was used, and so was your PIN, so you’re liable.’ So in theory fraud wasn’t the bank’s problem anymore. In practice, fraud went up, as you can see from Figure 12.4. Fraud rose initially, thanks to the many cards stolen from the mail during the changeover period; the banks rushed the roll-out as the merchants paid for the fraud until they had EMV terminals, which took time²⁴. There was then a surge in counterfeit, as shops started to get terminals, people got used to entering PINs in them, and the bad guys used bad terminals to steal card data to make mag-strip copies for use in ATMs. The biggest change though was a surge in mail order and online fraud. The net effect was that by October 2007 fraud was up 26% on the previous year [127].

The fraud figures would have been higher were it not for some blatant manipulation. UK bank customers were stopped from reporting card fraud to the police from April 2007; this deal was negotiated between the banks and the police by the Blair government in order to massage the crime statistics downwards, for which it was twice criticised by a parliamentary committee. Proper fraud reporting was only reintroduced in 2015²⁵. You can see the effects of this from the dip in the top, ‘card-not-present’, line in Figure 12.4 between 2008 and 2016; those missing millions include a lot of fraud costs that were simply dumped on cardholders. The banks also took over much of the financing of the small police unit that does investigate card fraud, so they have some control over such prosecutions as do happen.

12.6.1.2 ICVVs, DDA and CDA

In order to stop mag-strip fallback fraud, banks started from the mid-2000s to implement the *integrated circuit card verification value* (iCVV), a CVV that is different in the card data in the chip from the versions on the magnetic

²⁴This led to years of bad blood between merchants and banks.

²⁵By then it had served its political purpose. From 2007–2015 crime fell steadily, as it was moving online like everything else, and the online part wasn’t being counted properly. When Theresa May stood for election as leader of the Conservative Party in 2016, one of her claims to party members was that she’d cut crime despite cutting police numbers from 140,000 to 120,000. This claim was technically true, of reported crime at least. When Boris Johnson stood to replace her in 2019, he claimed that crime had fallen while he was Mayor of London from 2008–16. This claim was not even technically true, as once the Office of National Statistics insisted on counting properly from 2015, reported crime in Britain doubled.

strip (which is read in mag-strip ATM transactions) and on the signature strip (which is used online). Once all three are different, a chip-only skimmer can't in theory be used to make working mag-strip forgeries, and even if a merchant breaks the PCI DSS rules by keeping the signature-strip CVV on a database that then gets hacked, this CVV should not be enough to allow either a mag-strip forgery or a yes-card forgery (this is known as *channel separation*). The three CVVs are all calculated the same way – as a three-digit MAC on the PAN, version number and expiry date, computed using triple-DES, but with different values of a service code in the computation.

Dynamic data authentication (DDA) is the current default variant of EMV. It was used initially in Germany and from 2011 throughout Europe. DDA cards can do public-key cryptography: each has a private key *KC*, whose public key is embedded in the card certificate. The cryptography is used for two functions. First, when the card is first inserted into the terminal, it's sent a nonce, which it signs, assuring the terminal that the card is present (somewhere). The terminal then sends a block containing the 'unpredictable number' and the PIN encrypted using the card's public key, followed by the transaction data, and the card returns the application data cryptogram as before. This blocks skimmers from collecting the PIN²⁶. Back in the 2000s, DDA cards cost twice as much as SDA cards; cards are now very much cheaper, and the main extra cost of DDA is that card personalisation is slower.

Combined data authentication (CDA) is the Rolls-Royce variant. It's like DDA except that the card also computes a signature on the MAC. This enables safer offline operation, as the terminal can now verify the transaction. It ties the transaction data to the public key and to the fact that a PIN verification was performed – assuming, that is, the bank selected the option of including a PIN-verification flag in the transaction data. As for why this matters, consider the No-PIN attack.

12.6.1.3 The No-PIN attack

In 2009, we got credible complaints from several fraud victims that their cards had been stolen and then used in shops in transactions that their bank refused to refund, claiming that their PIN had been used – while they insisted that it could not have been compromised. Steven Murdoch, Saar Drimer and I investigated and found that a man-in-the-middle device could tell the terminal that the card had accepted the PIN, while telling the card that the terminal had initiated a chip-and-signature transaction [1366]. Banks in some countries don't use PINs, typically because regulators didn't allow the liability shift;

²⁶ As the card data are still in clear, a bad guy can still collect the PINs by visual observation and try mag-strip fallback, in the hope that the card issuer doesn't check CVVs; some banks apparently still don't.

and some banks in the UK allow customers to refuse a PIN and get a US-style chip-and-signature card instead.

In the protocol, the card data d_3 contains a flag indicating whether the PIN was verified or not, and the terminal separately returns a flag to its acquiring bank with the same information. However, the card flag is proprietary to the issuer, rather than an EMV standard, so it wasn't checked by default.

Four criminals were arrested in France in May 2011, and a forensic report was published by Houda Ferradi et al. in 2015 after their last appeals ran out. The No-PIN attack was accomplished by cutting out the chip from a stolen card and bonding it underneath the chip of a hobbyist smartcard, which was then programmed to perform the man-in-the-middle attack [680]. The gang stole some €600,000 over 7,000 transactions using 40 modified cards, of which 25 were seized by the police.

One UK bank blocked the attack in late 2010, but the block was removed in early 2011, perhaps because strict error handling was causing too many false positives (the terminal flag may be missing or wrong). The response to our disclosure of the vulnerability was somewhat negative; the banks' trade association wrote to the university asking it to take down the master's thesis of a student whose project had been to build a more robust man-in-the-middle device to investigate such issues (the university refused) [78]. It wasn't until 2017 that the attack definitively stopped working in the UK. However, if either the card or the merchant terminal was issued by a non-UK bank, the attack may still work.

Overlay smartcards may have been used in China and possibly Italy for such an attack in late 2018. These are very thin smartcards – about 180 microns thick – with contacts top and bottom. They were developed in China to support mobile phone roaming; the idea is that you stick one on top of your normal phone SIM to provide an alternative. The overlay acts as a classic man-in-the-middle. These devices are ideal for attacks; they're widely available, they save you having to build fiddly custom hardware, and they are easy to use (you program them in Java Card).

12.6.2 The preplay attack

On the 29th of June 2011, a Maltese customer of HSBC on holiday in Majorca found four ATM transactions debited to his account despite the fact that he had the card in his possession at the time. He'd eaten a meal the previous evening at a restaurant where he thought the staff suspicious, and wondered if his card had been copied. HSBC refused him a refund. So he contacted us, and we advised him to demand the transaction logs. It turned out that the 'unpredictable number' generated by the ATM was just a 16-bit counter that cycled every 3 minutes.

For a DDA/CDA card, the authentication step of EMV is:

$$\begin{aligned} T \rightarrow C &: T, N, t, X, d_2, \{PIN\}_{KC} \\ C \rightarrow T &: d_3, MAC_{KCB}(d_3, T, N, t, X) \end{aligned}$$

If I know which ‘unpredictable number’ N a given terminal will generate when the date t is tomorrow, and I have your card in my hand today, then I can work out an ARQC $MAC_{KCB}(d_3, T, N, t, X)$ that will work tomorrow in that machine. Mike Bond, Marios Choudary, Steven Murdoch, Sergei Skorobogatov and I therefore instrumented a payment card, by attaching tiny microcontroller, memory and clock chips, and investigated ATMs around Cambridge, England. We found that almost half of them used counters as ‘unpredictable numbers’. Others had random number generators with stuck bits. We then went back to the EMV specs and found that the test routine for a terminal only required the tester to draw three ‘unpredictable numbers’ and check that they were different. So could this be exploited at scale in Britain?

The next data point came in September 2012, when a Scottish sailor ordered a drink in a bar in Las Ramblas, a tourist street in Barcelona. He paid €33 with his EMV card, or so he thought. He passed out, woke up the following morning, and found later that day that his account at Lloyds Bank had been hit with ten debits of €3,300 each – a total of £24,000 at the time. The bank claimed that as the chip and PIN had been used, he was liable. He instructed lawyers who engaged us, and got the transaction logs from the bank. It turned out that the ten transactions had been spaced evenly, filed through three different acquiring banks, and that although they had been made in the same terminal, the terminal was registered with different characteristics at each of these banks. This was clear evidence of technical manipulation, and the sailor got his money back. We dubbed this the ‘pre-play attack’, as the essence is that rather than replaying old transactions, you record transactions that you will book in the future. If the same terminal will be used, then the fact that it’s the terminal that generates the ‘unpredictable number’ makes the attack easy [283].

Since then, we’ve seen cases of pre-play attacks in a number of countries in Europe, typically against customers of strip clubs and other sex industry firms. In the UK, a customer of a lap-dancing club in Bournemouth complained in 2014 that the staff got him drunk and charged him £7,500 in 13 transactions [335]. Following press publicity, over a dozen other victims came forward, including people who’d suffered debits after they were back home in bed [1952]. This suggested a pre-play attack rather than a simple case of whores rolling drunken customers; the local authority took an interest, and the club was put ‘on probation’ for six months. However, we could not persuade the police to raid the club and look for evidence, and eventually it got its full license back. In 2020, a club in London actually lost its license after making multiple charges to customers, with some victims being taken for tens of

thousands [1343]. Elsewhere in Europe too, it's turned out to be hard; one such club in Cracow, Poland, got raided but the police didn't look for technical evidence. Terminals can be compromised in various ways: apart from poor random number generators, their vendors can fail to patch their software, and some nowadays even let operators run apps on them²⁷. So the preplay problem persists, and I fear that eventually we'll have a homicide case on our hands. Pimps who do pre-play attacks often spike the victim's drink, and if you anaesthetise drunks and leave them to sleep it off on a whorehouse sofa while you loot their bank accounts, then sooner or later one of them will inhale some vomit.

An interesting point about security usability is that if you have four or five cards in your wallet or purse, then if you add up all their balances and credit limits, plus the extra 'unauthorised overdrafts' the card firms might give you, you're probably walking around with the price of a car. If you had that much cash in your pockets you'd probably not go into a bad part of town. You might not even be comfortable walking along the high street unless you had a couple of big friends with you. Payment cards obscure this prudential reflex, and enable us to spend much more than we would when calm and sober. Quite apart from fraud there are issues of vulnerability. The UK government, for example, has just banned the use of credit cards in casinos. If you're designing a system that takes payments online for regulated products, or if your products might be regulated in future because they can be addictive, then there's a bunch of issues you need to work through from ethics to geolocation to arbitration.

12.6.3 Contactless

Contactless payment was pioneered in the US by Mobil in 1997 and adopted in the 2000s in a number of transport systems from London to Tokyo. By 2007, you could just touch your phone on Japanese subway turnstiles in order to get through. Barclays issued the first contactless bank cards in the same year; VISA and Mastercard developed contactless variants of EMV for payment; and Google launched Android Pay in 2011 using the Mastercard PayPass standard²⁸. These early adopters struggled to get merchants to change their payment terminals, while the press and public remained sceptical. The market tipped in 2014 when Apple launched Apple Pay. By 2017 card payments had overtaken cash payments in the UK, because of the convenience of tap-and-pay; in 2018, debit cards overtook cash in the USA, and the share of US consumers using mobile online apps rose from 40% to 60% [707]. The

²⁷Dixons Carphone was fined £500,000 in 2020 after malware infected 5,390 tills, compromising the personal data of 14 million people and the data from 5.6 million cards. The previous year they'd been fined £400,000 for similar failures [2041].

²⁸Full disclosure: I did some work for Google on the design.

coronavirus pandemic in 2020 caused a further large-scale switch from cash to contactless, with UK ATM transactions falling from 232m in January to 91m in April and cash transactions falling from one in three to one in ten, while the contactless limit was raised from £30 to £45.

The basic idea is simple. In the USA, the terminal generates an ‘unpredictable number’ N , the card uses KC to generate a dynamic CVV as a 3-digit MAC on selected transaction data, and this is sent to the card-issuing bank along with N . In order to scale processing, the CVV keys may be made available to the HSMs of acquiring banks and to service firms that stand in for them. Risk is mitigated by transaction limits – in 2020, \$100 in the USA and £30 in the UK. Some issuers have a policy that after a certain number of contactless transactions, the cardholder must do a full EMV transaction with a PIN; this causes complications in some applications. There’s a variant in the UK and Europe where the card is made to generate an ARQC, which may be sent to the bank network for checking on a random basis.

As with regular EMV, N is generated by the terminal rather than by the bank, so pre-play attacks are possible, but in most countries are not an issue because of the transaction limits²⁹. However, the extension of contactless payments from cards to phones led to additional complexity, and the systems we have now are a mash-up of competing proposals from the two card schemes. In some Android phones, the credit card becomes a virtual credit card, implemented in Java Card in a secure element in the NFC chip that does the contactless RF protocol; Apple is something similar but with the key material in the iPhone’s secure enclave. Other Android phones use *host card emulation* where the NFC function is provided in software. NFC chips, or functionality, are starting to appear in watches, bracelets and other devices too. Many use *tokenization*, where the phone or other device is provisioned with a token³⁰ and key material by an online *tokenization service provider* (TSP) that acts on behalf of the banks. The merchant sends the transaction to the TSP, which performs the appropriate cryptographic operations in its HSM and forwards the transaction to the customer’s bank.

When contactless cards were rolled out, there were the usual implementation failures. In some stores, you could be charged for a transaction twice if you paid using a contact transaction yet left your wallet or purse near the terminal with a different, contactless, card in it. Researchers also wondered whether a crook could harvest credit card numbers, security codes and expiry dates by doing RFID transactions with victims’ cards as he brushes past them in the street – or by reading cards that have been sent in the mail, without opening the envelopes [896]. Martin Emms and colleagues from Newcastle showed this

²⁹In Germany, you do high-value card payments by doing a contactless payment, combined with online PIN verification as in an ATM transaction, but I’m not aware of any pre-play incidents.

³⁰There’s a *payment account reference* (PAR), a permanent pseudonym for the card number.

was possible, and found some even more interesting flaws: one UK bank even let you make one guess at a PIN; with others, the cash limit failed with foreign currency transactions [629]. On November 5th 2016 this led to a major fraud against Tesco Bank in the UK, when crooks in Brazil posted high-value transactions by using mag-strip data on a contactless interface on a mobile device. The bogus transactions amounted to £2.2m from 8,261 customer accounts and, although the eventual losses were only £700,000, the attack created a flood of fraud alerts with which the bank's weekend working procedures could not cope. It took until November 7th to block the fraudulent transaction stream, many legitimate transactions were also blocked, and normal customer service only restarted on the 9th. For this failure, and the distress caused to customers, the regulator fined the bank £16.4m [687].

In 2019, Leigh-Anne Galloway and Tim Yunusov found you could increase the contactless limit from £30 to £5500 by pretending to be a phone, and there's also an exploitable preplay attack. These attacks exploit the phone/card/terminal complexity. Android phones can have multiple limits depending on whether the screen is off or on, and whether the user has recently authenticated; and the phone and terminal send unauthenticated flags to each other [736]. In 2020, David Basin, Ralf Sasse, and Jorge Toro found an improved middleperson attack where a transaction is routed from a stolen card through two phones to a contactless terminal, which accepts a claim that the cardholder was verified using the phone's own authentication mechanism, such as a biometric [183]. Possibly such attacks could be prevented from scaling by the banks' fraud engines, and they haven't appeared in the statistics (yet). However, we still get complaints from cardholders who have been victims of fraud after their cards were stolen, and who claim their PIN wasn't compromised while their bank claims it must have been.

We're starting to see innovative variants that don't rely on specific hardware but allow other channels to be used to run the protocol, such as QR codes. We'll have to wait and see whether these lead to man-in-the-middle attacks at scale. The designers of second-generation EMV are talking of closing all the plaintext gaps and even adding distance bounding as an option. Such techniques could thwart many of the attacks described here. But the principal problems with contactless now that it has been running for several years are more prosaic, and include card collisions: if you have three cards in your wallet and you wave the wallet over a subway turnstile, which of them gets debited? The card-choice mechanisms aren't robust enough to give repeatable answers [1289]. This is an issue in London, where if you tap into the local transport system and fail to tap out again, you get billed the maximum fare. If the entry and exit turnstiles see different cards in your wallet, you end up paying double the maximum.

A recent development is *Software PIN on COTS* (SPoC) where the old assumption of a sort-of cleartext magnetic strip plus a strongly encrypted PIN is turned on its head: the SPoC rule is that devices where the PIN can't be strongly

protected must never learn the associated card data. If a PIN is entered in a merchant's iPhone, as we now see at Apple stores, there's another component called a *Secure Card Reader – PIN* (SCRIP) that plugs into the phone and accepts the customer card. Even if the phone app is compromised, the bad guy doesn't know which card the PIN will work for. The phone also passes the customer PIN to the SCRIP where it's encrypted and sent off for online verification. There's also work on ways to accept contactless payments on ordinary phones; and presumably the next step will be to pay people by tapping phones together, with one emulating the card and another the terminal. Direct phone-to-phone payments are already routine for tens of millions of people in countries such as Kenya and Bangladesh, as I'll describe below in section 12.8.1. It will be an interesting challenge to join up such systems with the world of EMV and make the whole thing safe to use.

12.7 Online banking

After credit and debit cards, the third thread in the world of payments is banking from your PC or phone.

In 1985, the first home banking service in the world was offered by the Bank of Scotland, whose customers could use Prestel, a proprietary email system operated by British Telecom, to make payments. When Steve Gold and Robert Schifreen hacked Prestel – as described previously in section 3.4.4.4 – it scared the press and the bankers. But there was little real risk. The system allowed only *nominated account payments* – you could only send money between your own accounts and to accounts you'd notified to the bank, such as your gas and electricity suppliers. In the early days this meant visiting a branch, filling a paper consent form, and waiting until the cashier checked the payee account number.

The early 1990s saw the rapid growth of phone banking, followed by bank websites from the late 1990s, and then the phishermen arrived.

12.7.1 Phishing

In section 3.3.3 I summarised the history of phishing from its beginnings in the 1990s to its use against online bank accounts from 2003. The bad guys started with crude lures from typosquatted domains like <http://www.barqlays.com> to deceptive ones like <http://www.barclays.othersite.com>; the banks' initial response was to blame their customers. The gangs rapidly got more sophisticated, as underground crime forums got going from around 2005 that supported increasing specialisation, just as in the normal economy. One gang would write the malware, another would herd the botnet, and we started

to see specialists who would accept hot money and launder it. The usual technique was to loot whatever customer accounts you could and send the money to compromised accounts at whatever bank was slowest at recovery. Of the £35m lost by UK banks in 2006, over £33m was lost by a single bank. One of its competitors told us that the secret was to spot account takeovers quickly and follow them up aggressively; if money's sent to a mule's account, he should find his account frozen before he can walk to Western Union. So the laundrymen learned to avoid them.

The industry learned to take down phishing websites as quickly as possible, and specialist takedown companies got good at this. The bad guys responded with tricks such as fast flux, where phishing sites were hosted on botnets and each mark who answered a lure was sent to a different IP address.

The second battlefield was asset recovery: the fraudsters would try to get the money overseas quickly and launder it, while the industry and law enforcement would try to stop them. Until May 2007, the preferred route was eGold, a company operated from Florida but with a legal domicile in the Caribbean, which offered unregulated electronic payment. After eGold got raided and closed down by the FBI, the villains started to send money through banks in Finland to their subsidiaries in the Baltic states and on to Russia. The third choice was wire-transfer firms like Western Union: the phishermen recruit *mules* by offering jobs in which they work from home and earn a commission as an agent for a foreign company. They are told their work is to receive several payments a week, deduct their own commission, and then send the balance onwards via Western Union [790]. There have also been various electronic money services in Russia and the Middle East [76]. Regulators played whack-a-mole: after one channel got closed down, another would open up. Banks through which money laundering was easy – known in the industry as 'mule banks' – even suffered less fraud, as the big gangs avoided targeting their customers in the hope that they'd stay useful for longer as the second link in the chain. This battle continues, with funds laundered through everything from cryptocurrencies to Amazon gift cards.

This emphasises the importance of the *prevent – detect – recover* model we introduced in section 12.2.4 above. Where authentication alone can't do the job, and you can't find other vulnerable points in the kill chain, you need to beef up the intrusion-detection mechanisms that complement them.

12.7.2 CAP

In 2006, the banks announced a two-factor authentication standard based on EMV, and this was launched the following year. The *Chip Authentication Program* (CAP)³¹ consists of a handheld password calculator in which you can

³¹This is its brand name for Mastercard, which invented it; VISA calls it *Dynamic Passcode Authentication* (DPA).

put your EMV bank card. You enter a PIN; the device gets the card to check this; you can then do one of three functions. You can get a one-time password to log on, you can answer a logon challenge, or you can authenticate a series of digits, typically from a payee account number and amount.

Current versions use a custom app on the EMV card, which uses a key shared with the issuing bank to compute a MAC on the supplied data and on an *application transaction counter* (ATC) (which is different from the one used for point-of-sale transactions). The response code is a truncated MAC and a truncated ATC. The security is discussed in [585]; briefly, if you put your card in a bad terminal, this can generate a CAP code to log on to your online banking service, though that's hard to scale as you typically also need a password. The availability of CAP readers means that a mugger who holds you up for your card can demand your PIN and check it, without having to march you to an ATM and risk being seen on CCTV. This has led to homicides, and was negligent design: other password calculators just return the wrong result if you supply the wrong PIN, including the early designs from the 1980s that I described in section 4.3.2.

12.7.3 Banking malware

As banks made simple phishing attacks harder by using ever more elaborate authentication mechanisms from partial password questions to the early two-factor authentication schemes, some bad guys just worked harder at persuasion. Even in Germany, whose banks gave their customers printed lists of one-time passwords, the crooks persuaded some customers to type them all in at once. Other bad guys turned to automation, in the form of banking malware. From 2007, a series of malware strains such as Zeus, Torpig, SpyEye, EMotet, Trickbot and Dridex stole hundreds of millions from banks and their customers worldwide, spreading by various techniques including Word macros and drive-by downloads. By 2011, man-in-the-middle attacks developed into *man-in-the-browser* attacks: when the user of an infected PC sets out to use their bank account, browser malware can actively modify transaction data so that what they see isn't what they authorise. This is why prudent banks now use a second factor such as CAP to authenticate at least the last four digits of the account number of any new payee. Banks who don't use CAP may use a dedicated authentication device instead, or a phone-based second factor.

12.7.4 Phones as second factors

Another response to the wave of phishing in the mid-2000s was to use the customer's phone as a second factor. It seems natural to send a confirmation, such

as: ‘If you really want to send \$7500 to Russian Real Estate LLC, please enter 4716 now in your browser.’ This appears to give the same benefits as CAP, but with a nicer user interface.

However, after South African banks started implementing this in 2007, they quickly saw the first *SIM swap* fraud. Some Johannesburg crooks got a new SIM for the phone number of the CFO of a charity that looks after orphaned and vulnerable children, and stole R90,460 from its bank account [1516]. The bank complained to the phone company, which was unsympathetic: phone companies sell minutes, not banking authentication services. As I discussed in section 3.4.1, such frauds spread from South Africa to Nigeria, then to the US from about 2014–5 where they were initially used to steal Instagram accounts, and from 2018 to loot people’s accounts at bitcoin exchanges [1094].

Such attacks now involve phone company insiders. In a 2019 case, an AT&T contractor in Tucson, Arizona, helped a SIM-swap gang steal \$2m from 29 victims [711]. In 2020, Kevin Lee and colleagues tried to swap ten SIMs on each of five US phone companies and found it to be easy: with the big companies, it worked every time. Vulnerabilities included authenticating people by asking about recent calls and recent top-ups, both of which can be manipulated by an attacker [1138]. It was also reported that SIM swappers were hacking phone company staff, by social-engineering them into installing remote access tools on their PCs, and then using the subverted machines to reassign target phone numbers to SIMs they controlled [486]. Tens of thousands of customer service reps are in a position to be careless, to get hacked or to take bribes from SIM swap gangs. Some already take bribes to unlock stolen phones, and once these underground communities link up we can expect things to get worse. There have also been a couple of cases, in Germany and the UK, where attackers exploited the SS7 signalling protocol to wiretap targets’ mobile phones remotely and steal codes that way [485] (I’ll discuss this further in section 22.2.3). In China, the law requires you to visit a phone shop and show ID to buy a SIM; in India, you need a biometric check and the phone company is also made partly liable for SIM-swap fraud. However, the direction of travel in the US and Europe is away from SMS as a second factor and towards a custom phone app³².

But as I wrote in the second edition of this book in 2007, “Two-channel authentication relies for its security on the independence of the channels ... if everyone starts using an iPhone, or doing VoIP telephony over wireless access points, then the assumption of independence breaks down.”

In the EU, the second payment services directive now requires banks to use two-factor authentication. So it’s becoming universal, and the bad guys are getting a lot of practice at breaking it. But what happens if you do your banking

³²Data on which banks use hardware tokens as second factors, or software tokens, or SMS, or no second factor at all, can be found at <https://twofactorauth.org/#banking>.

not on your laptop but on a phone app, and use another phone app as your second factor? If malware roots your phone, might it take over both apps, and loot your account?

At the time of writing (2020), the European Central Bank takes the view that two apps are OK so long as you use *runtime application self-protection* (RASP), which means that you obfuscate the app code using the kind of techniques developed during the 1980s for software copy protection and the 1990s for digital rights management. This makes experienced security engineers wince, as the history of such mechanisms is not a good one; it's told in the chapter on Copyright and DRM, and I discuss RASP further there in section 24.3.3. It is very hard to get any assurance of how long an obfuscation scheme will take to break; a break must be expected at any time, and the user of such a scheme had better be ready to patch it immediately that happens. And maybe all an attacker might need to do is shim one of the methods in the network stack to get at the strings containing the authentication exchange. So they might not need to extract the key or otherwise break the RASP mechanism itself.

12.7.5 Liability

One long-running argument has been over liability. The rush to online banking led many banks to adopt contract terms that put the risk of fraud on customers, in conflict with consumer law and traditional banking practice [278]. Unfortunately, the EU's Payment Services Directives of 2007 and 2015 went along with this by leaving a loophole in dispute resolution procedures³³.

A study of the bank fraud reimbursement terms and conditions of 30 banks operating in 25 countries showed a great variety of security advice, with much of it being vague, impractical or even conflicting [202]. For example, HSBC required unique PINs and passwords per account, contrary to advice given earlier by the UK banks' trade association which recommended customers to change all their PINs to the PIN issued for one of their cards. It also had the most onerous demands for Internet banking, including that the bank's URL must always be typed into the browser manually. It, and many other banks, required customers to use antivirus software; fewer required that software be patched up-to-date.

Banks meanwhile trained their customers to be vulnerable by business practices such as telling their customers to reveal their security data, even when making unsolicited calls. I've personally received an unsolicited call from my

³³British banks got the UK government to insert 'necessarily' into article 72(2): 'Where a payment service user denies having authorised an executed payment transaction, the use of a payment instrument recorded by the payment service provider, including the payment initiation service provider as appropriate, shall in itself not necessarily be sufficient to prove either that the payment transaction was authorised by the payer or that the payer acted fraudulently or failed with intent or gross negligence to fulfil one or more of the obligations under Article 69.'

bank saying ‘Hello, this is Lloyds TSB, can you tell me your mother’s maiden name?’ You’re sorely tempted to tell them to get lost, but if you do it will be a bother to reactivate or replace your payment cards. And even if the security ritual is made more complicated, the phishermen can still talk the marks through it, if need be as a man-in-the-middle (or browser) attack.

However, round about 2015, the bad guys started to evolve a better way.

12.7.6 Authorised push payment fraud

Authorised push payment (APP) fraud refers to bank transfers that customers are tricked into making. Figures only started to get collected in 2017 and the 2018 figures are not calculated in the same way to 2017, so we don’t have those on the graph in Figure 12.4. However the total, at £354.3 million, is second only to remote purchase fraud and more than the remainder put together.

A typical modus operandi is to look for someone who’s buying a house and send an email that seems to be from their lawyer informing them that the firm’s bank account number has changed. Another is to target vulnerable elderly people. In one case, a 92-year old war veteran was called by crooks pretending to be from his bank, bank A, who told him that the bank had been hacked, so he had to transfer his life savings of £120,000 to bank B for safekeeping. Two days later, his son visited and learned what had happened. In this particular case, their lawyers demanded that bank B produce the know-your-customer documents with which the mule account was opened. A few days later, bank B (which had a reputation as a ‘mule bank’) sheepishly refunded the money.

That victim was lucky, but many were less so. Large frauds had become easy because the banks had made large payments easy; in the old days, taking out £120,000 would have involved arranging a meeting with a bank manager at the very least. Yet online banking had been combined with a system of instantaneous payments which meant that fraudsters could get away with five-figure and even six-figure sums. In the UK this became such a sore point that Parliament’s Treasury committee noted that rapid irrevocable payments were simply the wrong default [1363], and the Payment Services Regulator changed the rules so that the banks now carry some of the liability. As a result, it has become significantly more complicated to make large bank transfers. Even medium-sized transactions get held up; if you try to pay your plumber a few thousand for renovating your bathroom, you’re likely to get anxious calls from the bank and be put through some security ceremonies.

Similar frauds have also been growing steadily against companies. Known as *business email compromise* (BEC), they now account for several billion dollars a year in losses [92]. In one recent case, a museum in the Netherlands agreed to buy an 1855 painting by John Constable for £2.4m from a London art dealer, but sent the money to the wrong account after crooks hacked the museum’s

email account and sent emails appearing to come from the dealer. The museum sued the dealer but lost [506]. Victim firms have much less protection than consumers do, but there are some mitigations that help both. For example, the UK regulator ordered banks to implement *confirmation of payee*: when you first make a payment to a new account, you'll be asked for the account holder's name and you'll be alerted if it's wrong [1363]. Still, prudent practice is now to hard-code company bank account numbers in business contracts, so that if firm A pays crook C instead of firm B, there's no room for argument over whose fault it was. In Germany – where firms have been using direct bank payments since the 20th century – it has been a legal requirement for years that companies print their bank account numbers on their letterheads.

12.8 Nonbank payments

There are many ways of making payments other than through banks. PayPal is the survivor of a number of email-based payment service providers that sprung up at the time of the dotcom boom, and has now in effect grown into a bank, with a portfolio of payment services both traditional and novel. A more traditional service is *hawala*, a term that refers to money-changers that serve communities of immigrants from South Asia and the Middle East, helping them to send money home. They compete with Western Union, which grew up with the Victorian telegraph network, and more modern payment service providers who provide low-cost foreign exchange transactions. Some of these services are used by cybercriminals, most notably PayPal and Western Union. Western Union is a particular problem for law enforcement as criminals can send money to any one of its many branches and withdraw it in cash. All such providers are regulated in the European Union by the E-money directive of 2009, which sets rules for capital and liquidity. There are also cryptocurrencies such as bitcoin, which some regulators currently exempt from e-money regulation, and which I'll discuss in the chapter on Advanced Cryptographic Engineering.

Two particular types of payment service merit separate discussion: phone payments and overlay payments, of which the leading examples are M-Pesa, AliPay/WeChat Pay, and Sofort.

12.8.1 M-Pesa

M-Pesa is a mobile phone banking service in Kenya, launched in 2007 by Vodafone. It took off rapidly and the firm that operates it, Safaricom, is now Kenya's largest financial institution. Over 200 similar services have been launched in less developed countries, and have been transformative in about 20 of them;

the largest such service now may be B-Kash in Bangladesh. Many such services have been growing rapidly during the 2020 coronavirus lockdown.

M-Pesa got going as a means for migrant workers in Nairobi and Mombasa to send money home to rural relatives. Before mobile phones came along, this meant posting cash, or sending it with friends or bus drivers. This was both inconvenient and risky, especially during a period of civil unrest in 2008 after a disputed election the year before. Once mobile phones became widespread, people started buying airtime as a means of transferring value, and from there it was a small step to transfer actual value. The security mechanisms of such systems tend to be simple, with an encrypted PIN, payee and value sent over SMS or USSD. The key success factor is that phone companies have built networks of tens of thousands of sales agents who can turn cash into digital credit and back again – networks that reach the smallest villages, unlike the legacy banks. The operational problems have to do with people sending money to the wrong phone number by mistake, and integrating incoming M-Pesa payments with business systems.

12.8.2 Other phone payment systems

Many other countries have phone payment systems, or have widely-used proprietary payment systems that work reasonably well on phones. An example of these is PayPal, which redirects you from a merchant website to PayPal's, where you log in to authorise payment. Up until 2013, this was the world's leading phone payment system. Since then the leading phone payment mechanism has been AliPay, a proprietary payment app run by the Alibaba group in China. It is closely followed by Tencent's WeChat Pay; in 2020 they had 54% and 39% of the Chinese mobile-payment market respectively. Smartphone payments took off rapidly in China, as M-Pesa did in Kenya, because banking used to be unsatisfactory outside the main cities [608]. They have become the default payment mechanism in China, and use a visual payment channel: a merchant displays a QR code that the customer scans to send the right amount to the right account. AliPay and WeChat Pay operate not just as business platforms but as national infrastructure, and since 2018 are closely regulated: the People's Bank of China gets copies of all transaction data [1532]. This fits with the Chinese approach to information sovereignty we discussed in section 2.2.2. And both apps now support payment using your face, aligning with the growing use in China of face recognition, a technology I discuss in section 17.3. India also has a low-cost phone payment system in UPI, linked to the national Aadhaar biometric card; on these national payment and identity layers sit a number of competing payment apps.

12.8.3 Sofort, and open banking

Credit cards were not traditionally used in Germany, which was inconvenient when people started shopping online. One approach was to order goods from a website, get the merchant's bank account details and a transaction reference number, go to your bank and pay, and then go back to the merchant's website the next day and put in the payment details.

Sofortüberweisung is German for 'immediate payment' and set out to solve this problem by means of an industrialised man-in-the-middle attack. In order to buy a plane ticket, for example, you click the 'sofort' ('immediate') button on the airline's checkout page, and the service opens up a frame in which you enter your bank name and account number. Sofort then logs on to your bank as you, and presents you with the bank's authentication challenge. Once you pass this, it goes into your account, checks that there's enough money, and sends itself the payment. It then redirects back to the airline and you get your ticket [80]. The effect is to make online shopping easier, but also to deprive the banks of card transaction fees (the merchant pays about a third as much as they'd have paid for a card transaction).

The banks sued Sofort for unfair competition and for inciting customers to breach bank terms of service by entering their credentials at Sofort's website. They lost after the German Federal Antitrust Office argued that the banks' terms of service hindered competition and were designed to exclude new business models like Sofort's. Sofort got a banking licence and the other banks just had to compete.

The upshot was the EU's second payment services directive (PSD2), also known as 'open banking'. Since January 2018, banks must open up their systems, not just by releasing transaction data in a standard format to other regulated financial institutions if their customer requests it, but allowing the other institution to act as the customer does. The upside will include banks and fintech companies offering dashboards that will let you see all your holdings across all the banks with which you have an account, and move money between them to get the best deals. The downside is that fraud and money laundering are migrating rapidly to open banking channels. If a crook sets up an account at bank A, fills it with stolen money, authorises an account at fintech B to operate it, then uses B to get A to send money to C, A is not allowed to refuse the transaction. The upshot is that traditional controls on fraud and money laundering become much less effective. So there will be more jobs for security engineers³⁴. We will have to wait and see how all this develops.

³⁴Open Banking means migrating from the old ISO 8583 standard to the newer ISO 20022. This enables a move from 8-byte PIN blocks to 16-byte and thus from 3DES to AES; from later batch settlement of transactions to real-time gross settlement; and much much more.

The introduction of QR code based payment into the EMV standards opens up the possibility of scaling something like Sofort's payment mechanism worldwide. As well as the customer presenting a payment instrument as a QR code, the merchant can present a payment demand in this way, so that the customer's phone can initiate an online bank payment. Existing phone payment systems like M-Pesa also require the customer to scan a QR code or enter data manually if their phone can't do this. There may be some scope for innovation and convergence here, so we'll have to wait and see how it develops.

12.9 Summary

Banking systems are critical to the security engineer because that's how stolen money gets moved – and fascinating in other ways too. Bookkeeping gives us a mature example of systems oriented towards authenticity and accountability rather than confidentiality. The Clark-Wilson security policy provides a model of this approach, which evolved over centuries. Making it work well in practice means sophisticated functional separation, whose design involves input from many disciplines. The threat model has a particular emphasis on insiders.

Payment systems played a significant role in the development of cryptography through their use in the first generation of ATM systems; the adoption of smartcard-based payments has changed the fraud landscape once more.

Finally, we have seen several waves of attacks on electronic banking systems since the mid-2000s – by phishing account credentials, by man-in-the-browser attacks by specialised malware, by SIM swap attacks on the mobile phones used as a second authentication factor, and by social engineering customers to send their money to the bad guys directly. These have progressively explored the possible combinations of high tech and low cunning, and they teach the importance of a holistic approach to fraud mitigation. The turbulence caused by the pandemic is likely to emphasise this, but at least the mechanisms whose use is surging, such as contactless payments in developed countries and phone payments elsewhere, have had a few years to bed down.

Research problems

I've always distrusted the cartel of big accountancy firms – down from the Big Eight in the 1980s to the Big Four now, following three mergers and the failure of Arthur Anderson in the Enron scandal. A student and I once wondered whether being a client of a big accountancy firm was a signal of wrongdoing, but a brief analysis threw up no evidence either way. Thereafter when I served

on a governing body or audit committee, I always proposed using a local firm, as it was cheaper, but only once managed to get a change (and that was from one big firm to another). When I served on our university's governing body I had to put up with this cartel shaking us down for a million a year and providing nothing useful in return; most of the work was done by juniors. I thought the Germans might be better off as their rules prevent auditors selling consultancy services, but the Wirecard scandal punctured that illusion. The UK government still decided after that scandal (and many others) that from 2024, the audit firms must separate their audit and consulting practices in such a way that audit partners' remuneration comes only from the audit business and is not cross-subsidised from consultancy [1052]. It would be great if that works, but I fail to see how it can have any real effect on most of the concrete problems described in this book, whether the internal control issues analysed in this chapter or the assurance issues which I tackle in section 28.1. The audit cartel imposes huge social costs and is not quite what we expect from standard economic analysis³⁵. It needs to be understood better.

Designing internal controls is still pre-scientific; we could do with tools to help us do it in a more systematic, less error-prone way. Just as many security failures come from poor usability at the level of both users (who are offered dangerous choices as defaults) and programmers (who're given access-control and other tools that are insanely tricky to use), so many internal control failures come from administrative mechanisms that are designed for the comfort of the auditor rather than to be actually usable in real organisations. How can we do this better?

Payment systems are at the one time deeply conservative, being in many ways little changed since the 1970s, and also constantly evolving, as the mechanisms moved from ATMs and HSMs to chip cards and to crypto chips in mobile phones. The ground's also shifting as attacks evolve (as with SIM swap) and the environment changes (as with open banking). Maintaining resilience in the face of such change takes work. As EMV implementations get tightened up, and as the second version of EMV starts to tackle the residual vulnerabilities described here, we can expect fraud to move to the periphery: to the customer, via account takeover; to the merchant, via hacking attacks, refund scams, coupon scams and the like; and to the bank, via pre-issue frauds and technical attacks on the systems for authorisation and settlement.

If account takeover is going to become ever-more pervasive, what are the implications? I suspect that our regulatory approach needs an overhaul: blaming ordinary customers for harm they suffer from systems designed by others is wrong. But what should we do? Should we go for radical transparency, impose

³⁵See the Lerner-Tirole model discussed in section 28.2.8 for a model of how firms faced with a compliance requirement usually choose the cheapest supplier. Why do most large firms and even large universities go for famous but expensive firms when they're all but useless at detecting whether executives are crooks or firms are trading while insolvent?

payment delays, or put more weight on rapid asset recovery? Is there some smart combination, such as making the speed and finality of payment a function of the known standing of both payer and payee? Or should regulators just keep pushing liability back to the banks and let them work it out?

The context in early 2020 was that retail banks are making less money than they used to, because of low interest rates and growing competition, so bank security engineers are being asked to do more with less. Social media are making downtime more painful; if a bank's mobile app is down for 15 minutes because of a DDoS attack on a gateway, there can be a twitter storm that causes directors to phone the Chief Operating Officer. Such incentives push in the direction of moving stuff to the cloud, but this raises further problems; we'll discuss cloud HSMs later in the chapter on Advanced Cryptographic Engineering. The coronavirus pandemic has been great for payment service providers, with PayPal's share price up by about a half; as to where it may drive fintech innovation, perhaps it will be around video. Videoconferencing is having to replace in-branch meetings for complex and high-value transactions such as loans. The latest wave of fintechs such as Monzo were already getting customers to record a selfie video as part of the onboarding process, so that call centre staff helping a customer recover an account from a lost or stolen phone could check they're the same person who opened the account. What else?

Further reading

Andrew Jamieson wrote a 100-page ebook on EMV for Underwriters' Laboratories – ten times what I had space for here [979] – and that may be a useful stepping stone from my short summary to the thousands of pages of specifications from PCI SSC and EMVco [630]. I don't know of any comprehensive book on core banking systems, although there are many papers on payment systems available from the Bank for International Settlements: the most recent, as we go to press in 2020, analyses quality of service and notes that while payments within Europe mostly take under 30 minutes, a combination of multiple intermediaries, business hours, time zones, capital controls, liquidity and ancient technology mean that payments to Asia and Africa can take hours to days [163]. If you're going to do any real work on internal control, you'd better read ISA 315 [952]; its interpretation by the big four accountancy firms now makes the weather on internal controls. I'll revisit this topic in Part 3. To understand what can actually go wrong, read the judgment in the Horizon case [186] and the survey of corporate fraud by Alexander Dyck, Adair Morse and Luigi Zingales [596].

The IBM system of generating and protecting ATM PINs was described in a number of articles, such as [521] and [953], while early ATM networks are described in [764]. For the basics of ATM fraud, see [56]; while the

transcript of the trial of an HSBC insider gives a snapshot of typical internal controls in electronic banking systems [1572]. The first survey of underground markets was 2007 by Jason Franklin, Vern Paxson, Adrian Perrig and Stefan Savage [714]; even then, the focus was on bank fraud rather than on drugs or malware. There's a rich literature since then on topics from the social dynamics of underground communities [1347] to the Russians behind the Dridex malware campaign [1625]. Colleagues and I have contributed to big surveys of cybercrime in 2012 [91] and 2019 [92]. There's a collection of our group's writings on bank fraud at our Bank Fraud Resource Page, at <https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~rja14/banksec.html>. For an authoritative case study of a large card fraud, see the FCA's 2018 ruling against Tesco Bank [687]. This not only sets out how the fraud was done, but how the controls failed at multiple points and how the regulators calculated the fine.

Finally, for the political and legislative history of the US intelligence initiative against terrorist finance and its efforts to get SWIFT data by covert or legislative means, see David Bulloch's thesis [343].