

*Fraud fluctuates so much, it can be difficult to know what “good” is.*

**Peer benchmarking for plastic cards is one of the most requested resources.**



## The Importance to Compare and Contrast Performance

Developing and monitoring a risk appetite around fraud tolerance by incorporating fraud loss, prevention costs, resource costs, etc. provides the credit union with established targets to measure against. In fact, plastic card loss peer benchmarking allows you to measure performance with your peers while sharing key trends and insights.

## 2018 Plastic Card Loss Benchmarking Survey

Access to plastic card loss data from across the credit union industry can be essential in assisting you to better understand your level of risk and the effectiveness of your mitigation efforts.

Establish a baseline by participating in the 2018 Plastic Card Loss Benchmarking Survey with your peers. Your information is essential in developing benchmark, plastic card loss data for the credit union industry. Depending on the level of data you'd like to receive in return, you can simply take either the:

- [High-Level Benchmark Survey](#)
- [In-Depth Benchmark Survey](#)

Due to complexity of some data fields, all questions are optional.

Benchmarking allows for YOY comparisons in fraud loss, spend and a fraud metric (fraud loss ÷ spend x 100) for both debit and credit cards - in addition to helping you identify false-positive ratios. Monitoring and evaluating metrics like false-positive ratios for rules currently in place and future rules should be included as part of the credit union strategy on a regular basis.

Over the last two years, several hundred credit unions of all sizes have participated. Rest assured, all information shared remains masked and confidential by individual respondents and only aggregate data will be shared with other participants. Following the close of the survey, you'll receive a personalized analysis of the information (sample shown above) along with contributing factors stemming from emerging risks impacting credit unions.

DEBIT CARD COMPARISON				
Benchmark	Metric	2015	2016	YOY
All CUs (N=49)	Fraud \$	\$ 332,035	\$ 351,850	6%
	Spend \$	\$ 358,818,395	\$ 395,689,178	10%
	Fraud Metric	\$ 0.093	\$ 0.089	-4%
	Avg Fraud Metric	\$ 0.257	\$ 0.201	-22%
Peer CUs - Spend (N=12)	Fraud \$	\$ 225,971	\$ 295,266	31%
	Spend \$	\$ 215,785,967	\$ 250,188,979	16%
	Fraud Metric	\$ 0.105	\$ 0.118	13%
	Fraud Metric	\$ 0.160	\$ 0.027	-83%
Credit union name	Fraud \$	\$ 154,156	\$ 28,311	-82%
	Spend \$	\$ 96,512,719	\$ 104,164,539	8%
	Fraud Metric	\$ 0.160	\$ 0.027	-83%
	Fraud Metric	\$ 0.160	\$ 0.027	-83%
CREDIT CARD COMPARISON				
Benchmark	Metric	2015	2016	YOY
All CUs (N=39)	Avg Fraud \$	\$ 175,068	\$ 169,432	-3%
	Avg Spend \$	\$ 102,251,636	\$ 112,130,797	10%
	Fraud Metric	\$ 0.171	\$ 0.151	-12%
	Avg Fraud Metric	\$ 0.200	\$ 0.230	15%
Peer CUs - Spend (N=12)	Avg Fraud \$	\$ 32,125	\$ 35,184	10%
	Avg Spend \$	\$ 15,764,865	\$ 15,807,579	0%
	Fraud Metric	\$ 0.204	\$ 0.223	9%
	Fraud Metric	\$ 0.204	\$ 0.223	9%
Credit union name	Fraud \$	\$ 13,683	\$ 12,847	-6%
	Spend \$	\$ 2,594,729	\$ 803,843	-69%
	Fraud Metric	\$ 0.527	\$ 1.598	203%
	Fraud Metric	\$ 0.527	\$ 1.598	203%

ALL CUs N =	49
Average Asset	\$ 1,296,723,521
Spend Range	\$100MM - \$300MM
Peer CUs (Spend)	12
Average Asset	\$ 939,041,888

ALL CUs N =	39
Average Asset	\$ 1,360,441,342
Spend Range	\$0MM - \$30MM
Peer CUs (Spend)	12
Average Asset	\$ 352,569,947