

Payment Card Industry – Data Security Standards









Background

The Payment Card Industry Data Security Standards (PCI DSS) is an information security standard for organisations that handle credit card payments. The standard was created to increase controls to protect cardholder data and to reduce credit card fraud. Any cardholder data breach would be seen as a failure to protect personal data and potentially attract monetary penalties under General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) and could even mean barring from accepting card payments in future.

Compliance with this standard is not a legal requirement; however, card merchants and software suppliers may ask for compliance as part of their contract or agreement. The standard requires testing of IT connections and certification that staff have had training with regard to card usage, storing and disposal of card information.

Purpose & Scope of Review

We carried out a review of compliance with PCI DSS requirements and to provide assurance for the Section 151 Officer, Senior Management and inform the Annual Internal Audit Report and Annual Governance Statement.

The review focused on the following areas:

- Roles and responsibilities;
- Policy and procedures;
- Training and awareness
- Payment Card Environment;
- Processing card payment data;
- Third party processors' compliance; and
- Compliance testing and self-assessment.

Audit Opinion

Overall, our testing confirms that not all services taking card payments on behalf of the council can demonstrate that they fulfil the requirements of the standards.

Finance and ICT are aware that there are weaknesses and standards are not being met across all areas. Cross-service involvement is required to achieve compliance, but overall responsibility to develop a strategy or programme has not been assigned to ensure that suitable arrangements are in place corporately i.e. coordinating a self-assessment, accreditation, training, ICT security (Risk issue 1).

The Information Security Policy covers Chip and Pin and the council's response should there be a data security breach involving card data. However, it does not reference the need to comply with the PCI DSS or guidance as to how this would be achieved. (Risk Issue 3)

There is a lack of consistency regarding training to ensure that staff are suitably aware of how to handle card payments securely, with several departments adopting a 'common sense' or informal approach. The departments with the largest volume of staff taking card payments have records to evidence the training that has been given (for instance, Leisure services and Customer services). (Risk issue 2).

Several services are able to take card payments in person, on the phone or online. The standards require that lines carrying card data are tested quarterly, including those that go through our firewalls, to verify that they are secure. These lines are a means of transferring the information and, for very short periods of time, when portals are open they could be vulnerable to a cyber-attack. The majority of card payment traffic is through the council's internet and firewalls, but some use:

- A direct phone line dial-up connection that is outside the council's firewalls.
- A SIM card to transfer data.

Currently, only payments administered by Capita (which includes payments taken by the cash office, contact centre and some other services areas) and the provider for Café R (Payment Sense) are compliant with this requirement.

There are several agreements with one card service provider (Worldpay), which has resulted in different levels of charges. This includes small penalty charges as two card payment terminals are not compliant (both terminals need upgrading to avoid future penalties). The Business and Risk Manager has tried to bring all the agreements under one charging structure to aid administration and obtain value for money, but, so far, he has been unable to gain the agreement of the provider. (See Risk Issue 4)

The council has agreements with several other card service providers due to:

- Software systems compatibility;
- Services involve ICT and procurement too late to explore the possibility of using an existing provider, and
- Urgency to finalise an agreement so as not to cause delay to a project completion date (Links to Risk Issue 5)

These providers are not currently charging penalties for non-compliance.

Corporately, there is little oversight of the multiple agreements in place making the card environment more complex than it needs to be. This raises the risk of security vulnerabilities going undetected (Risk issue 4)

The council should also be ensuring that its external service providers are compliant with these standards, but there was no evidence that this was requested when agreements were being formed.

The council has signed a declaration with one supplier where the council confirmed that it is compliant with the standards. Also, a pay by phone contract with one supplier is currently being extended. To use the supplier's pay by phone function, the card details must be pre-registered, but the contract with makes no mention of:

- Length of time such data is retained;
- Supplier's compliance with PCI DSS; nor
- Secure disposal of any card data once the contract is ended.

We raise a risk issue to ensure that procurement and contracts consider PCI-DSS requirements and that suitable checks are carried out to verify that card payment data processed on the council's behalf is managed in accordance with the standards (Risk Issue 5).

While there are areas of good practice, we give a low assurance rating due to the nature of the issues and control weaknesses identified. Co-operation across all services is required to drive this forward to ensure that the council meets the required standards.

Low assurance

Significant weaknesses in management of risks and/or controls that put achievement of objectives at risk.

Action Plan

Audit Review of: PCI DSS

Date: November 2019

| Corporate Risk/Issue Severity Key | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Critical - Significant issues to be brought to the | | | |
| 0 | attention of SLT, CET, Cabinet Lead Members and | | | |
| | Corporate Governance Committee | | | |
| | Major - Corporate, strategic and/or cross-service | | | |
| 2 | issues potentially requiring wider discussion at SLT | | | |
| | and/or CET | | | |
| _ | Moderate - Operational issues that are containable at | | | |
| 3 | service level | | | |

| Risk Issue 1 | The council does not have a programme or strategy in place to ensure corporate compliance with PCI-DSS. This poses the risk of financial and/or reputation loss and potential withdrawal from payment card acceptance programmes. | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------|--|--|
| Background | There is no formal plan or programme which is regularly reviewed/updated to ensure compliance with PCI-DSS. This is compounded by the fact that responsibility for taking this forward corporately has not been assigned to ensure that all services that take card payments are compliant. | | | | |
| Once responsibility is assigned, the programme should comprise of: • An annual PCI-DSS attestation of compliance along with completion of a self-assessment questionnaire; • Production of a map of the card environment to show the type of transactions and where they are taken; • Quarterly network scans by an approved scanning vendor in accordance with PCI-DSS. | | | | | |
| Action (Ref) | Agreed Management Action Responsibility Deadli | | | | |
| 1.1 | Report to SLT to ensure corporate buy-in. | Chief Accountant / Chief Internal Auditor | 31/12/2019 | | |
| 1.2 | A cross disciplinary Task and Finish Group/Project team will be set up to implement the changes required. The Key services that need to be included in the T&FG include: • Finance • ICT • Information Management • Customer Services | Business and Risk Manager | 31/12/2019 | | |

| | Procurement Service Service / User Group Representation. | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1.3 | The T&FG will devise a programme which will take account of the issues raised. It is vital that SLT have input into and buy-into the programme as it will impact a number of services. This T&FG will feed into the Information Governance Group to update and monitor progress and escalate any issues. | Task and finish group/ Head of Business Improvement and Modernisation/ Business and Risk Manager | 31/10/2020 | | | | |
| Risk Issue 2 | Training provision and record keeping of training is inconsistent and weak in some areas. There is a risk that staff are unaware of requirements to protect cardholders' data resulting in weak security of sensitive personal information. | | | | | | |
| Background Detail | | | | | | | |
| Action (Ref) | Agreed Management Action | Responsibility | Deadline | | | | |
| 2.1 | The Task and Finish Group to develop and agree training for all relevant staff. | | | | | | |

| Risk Issue 3 | Lack of policy or procedure to direct staff towards PCI DSS compliance. | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------|--|--|--|
| Background Detail | Compliance with the PCI DSS is not a legal requirement though card providers (e.g. Visa their agreement. The current Information Security policy does have a section that cover procedures should be in the event of a card data breach. However, it makes no mention as to what is required to achieve compliance. | s the use of Chip and Pin and wh | nat our | | | |
| Action (Ref) | Agreed Management Action Responsibility Dead | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Set up a separate policy or procedures to cover the council's approach to compliance with the PCI-DSS to incorporate procedure to take in the event of a card data breach. | Task and Finish Group | 31/03/2020 | | | |

| This will link to other relevant policies such as the Information Security Policy and Data | |
|--|--|
| Protection Policy | |

| Risk Issue 4 | The council's various agreements with card providers may not offer value for money and make it difficult to administer as the card payment environment is more complex that it needs to be. Not only has this resulted in different fees and charges, there is an increased risk of vulnerabilities and non-compliance going undetected. | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| | The council's main card provider 'Worldpay' charges are likely to rise over the coming you majority of these charges are made up of a 'per transaction fee' (the rate varies across | | oy card as the | | | |
| Background Detail | When new payment systems are taken up, the software supplier invariably has their favoured card merchants which the council then igns up with rather than Worldpay. Other card merchant service providers should be explored to ensure that we are obtaining the sest value for money, and ICT involved at an early stage to ensure compatibility. | | | | | |
| | as been explored but have prove g competitive tendering/excepti | | | | | |
| Action (Ref) | Agreed Management Action | Responsibility | Deadline | | | |
| 4.1 | Cost comparisons with card service providers to be explored. This will need to take into account the full costs, including per transaction costs. A report to be taken to SLT to give assurance that value for money is being achieved. Contracts/arrangements for card payments will be consolidated where possible. | Task and Finish Group | 31/10/2020 | | | |

Risk Issue 5

PCI-DSS compliance is not always considered as part of procurement or contractual agreements with suppliers that take card payments on behalf of the council.

| | The council does not request evidence that external service providers are compliant with its behalf. | n PCI-DSS in order for them to re | eceive money on | | | |
|--------------|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Background | t; where the council is agreeing t | that it is | | | | |
| Detail | One contract is nearing its end, with the option for monthly roll-on, has a requirement for cards to be preregistered with them before fees can be paid by card over the phone. The contract makes no reference to company being PCI DSS compliant, how long card data is retained for, or what they can use this data for. When the contract is finally terminated, clarification will be required as to how they wi securely dispose of any card data relating to this contract. | | | | | |
| Action (Ref) | ef) Agreed Management Action Responsibility | | | | | |
| 5.1 | The Task and Finish Group will explore possible measures and update the procurement process (if deemed necessary) to ensure that PCI DSS is always considered when procuring card payment suppliers/services. | Task and Finish Group/procurement | 31/03/2020 | | | |
| 5.2 | Include PCI-DSS as a requirements within Denbighshire Leisure's (ADM) contract T&Cs. | Legal Services Manager | 31/03/2020 | | | |

Appendix 1 – Risk Matrix and Assurance Ratings

| | | >70% | Almost Certain | A | | | | | |
|------------|--|------------|----------------------|---------|---|--|--|--|---|
| q | Event likely to occur in most circumstances | 30- 70% | Likely | В | | | | | |
| likelihood | Event will possibly occur at some time | 10- 30% | Possible | С | | | | | |
| _ | Event unlikely and may occur at some time | 1- 10% | Unlikely | D | | | | | |
| | Event rare and may occur only in exceptional circumstances | <1% | Rare | Ε | | | | | |
| | | | | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Very Low | Low | Medium | High | Very High |
| | | | Service Performan | | Minor errors or disruption | Some disruption to activities/ customers | Medium Disruption to core activities / customers | Significant disruption to core activities. Key targets | Very High Unable to delivery core activities. Strategic aims compromised |
| | | | | ice | Minor errors | Some disruption to activities/ | Disruption to core activities/ | Significant disruption to core activities. Key | Unable to delivery core activities. Strategic aims |
| | | | Performan | on I | Minor errors or disruption Trust recoverable with little effort or | Some disruption to activities/ customers Trust recoverable at modest cost with resource allocation within | Disruption to core activities / customers Trust recovery demands cost authorisation beyond existing | Significant disruption to core activities. Key targets missed Trust recoverable at considerable cost and management | Unable to delivery core activities. Strategic aims compromised Trust severely damaged and full recovery questionable |

| Levels of Assurance | | Definition | Management Intervention |
|------------------------|---------------------|---|--|
| | High Assurance | Risks and controls well managed and objectives being achieved. | Minimal action required, easily addressed by line management. |
| | Medium Assurance | Minor weaknesses in management of risks and/or controls but no risk to achievement of objectives. | Management action required and containable at service level. Senior management and SLT may need to be kept informed. |

| | Low Assurance | Significant weaknesses in management of risks and/or controls that put achievement of objectives at risk. | Management action required with intervention by SLT and / or CET. |
|--|------------------|---|---|
| | No Assurance | Fundamental weaknesses in management | Significant action required in a number |
| | | of risks and/or controls that will lead to | of areas. Require immediate attention |
| | Assurance | failure to achieve objectives. | from SLT or CET. |

Report Recipients

- Chief Executive
- Head of Business Improvement and Modernisation
- Head of Legal, HR & Democratic Services
- Chief Accountant/ S151 Officer
- Chief Digital Officer
- Business and Risk Manager
- Business Continuity and ICT Security Officer
- Business Information Team Manager
- Legal and Procurement Operations Manager
- Team Leader Communications & Campaign Management
- Strategic planning and Performance Officer
- Scrutiny Co-ordinator
- Corporate Director Economic and Community Ambition
- Chair Performance Scrutiny Committee
- Lead Member for Corporate Services and Strategic Direction
- Lead Member for Finance, Performance & Strategic Assets
- Corporate Governance Committee

Internal Audit Team On 1824706974 irene.griffiths@denbighshire.gov.uk Key Dates Review commenced Review completed Reported to Corporate Governance Committee Proposed date for 1st follow up review Internal Audit Team On 1824706974 irene.griffiths@denbighshire.gov.uk August 2019 20 November 2019 April 2020