



Article

Cybercrime and International Legal Cooperation

Article History:

Name of Author:

Stephen Smith¹, Patricia Torres²,
Jennifer Mitchell³ and Rebecca
Greene⁴

Affiliation: ¹Adjunct Faculty, School of
Economics and Commerce, Central
Eurasia University, Austria

²Professor, School of Business, Danube
International University, Austria

³Lecturer, Department of Corporate
Governance, Danube International
University, Austria

⁴Research Associate, Department of
Banking and Insurance, Alexandria School
of Governance, Austria

**Corresponding Author: Stephen
Smith**

How to cite this article: Stephen
Smith, et, al. Cybercrime and
International Legal Cooperation. *J
Community Med* 2021;2(1);22-25.

©2021 the Author(s). This is an open access
article distributed under the terms of the
Creative Commons Attribution License
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

Abstract: The transnational nature of cybercrime demands coordinated international legal cooperation to ensure effective prevention, investigation, and prosecution. As cyberattacks increasingly target individuals, institutions, and infrastructure across borders, legal frameworks like the Budapest Convention and UN-led initiatives have emerged to promote harmonized definitions, evidence-sharing protocols, and mutual legal assistance mechanisms. This article explores the various treaties, bilateral and regional agreements, and technical networks that facilitate cross-border responses to cybercrime. It analyzes procedural mechanisms such as mutual legal assistance treaties (MLATs), extradition frameworks, and 24/7 contact networks, while also highlighting the legal, procedural, and technical challenges that hinder cooperation—such as divergent laws, bureaucratic delays, resource disparities, and concerns over human rights and sovereignty. Using data visualizations and global participation maps, the article underscores both progress and persistent gaps in international cooperation. Emerging trends—including UN cybercrime treaty negotiations, AI-powered investigations, fast-track data sharing, and capacity building for developing countries—suggest a trajectory toward more inclusive and efficient collaboration. The article concludes with best practices for improving global legal cooperation, emphasizing harmonization, transparency, trust-building, and the integration of privacy protections into all enforcement strategies.

Keywords: Cybercrime, international legal cooperation, Budapest Convention, cross-border investigations, mutual legal assistance treaties, MLATs, extradition, UN cybercrime treaty, data preservation,

INTRODUCTION

The exponential growth of digital technology has facilitated global connectivity but also given rise to cybercrime—activities ranging from financial fraud to corporate espionage, ransomware attacks, and large-scale theft of personal data. Since cybercrime routinely crosses borders, international legal cooperation is essential for effective prevention, investigation, and prosecution. This article examines the legal frameworks, key treaties, mechanisms for cooperation, substantial challenges, and evolving trends in the fight against transnational cybercrime, supported by statistical figures and graphical visualizations.

1. The Nature of Transnational Cybercrime

Cybercrime is inherently borderless:

- Criminals can attack victims or systems from anywhere in the world.
- Evidence is often virtual (e.g., data logs, cloud storage) and rapidly altering.
- Perpetrators exploit differences in national laws, enforcement capacity, and jurisdictional boundaries.

Types of cross-border cybercrime include:

- Hacking and unauthorized system access
- Phishing and online fraud
- Ransomware attacks
- Theft and sale of sensitive information
- Distribution of illegal content

Graph 1: Global Growth Trend of Cybercrime Incidents (2015–2025)

[image:1]

Annual count of reported international cybercrime incidents, showing a pronounced upward trajectory, especially post-2019.

2. LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

A. The Budapest Convention (Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime)

- **First and most comprehensive international treaty** addressing cybercrime, providing for the harmonization of substantive criminal law, procedural law, and mechanisms for cross-border cooperation^{[1][2]}.
- Open to all countries, not just Council of Europe members.
- **Key Provisions:**
 - Standardization of definitions for cyber offences.
 - Provisions for mutual legal assistance (MLA) and extradition.
 - Creation of 24/7 points of contact for urgent cooperation.
 - Data preservation requests and fast track procedures^{[2][3]}.

B. United Nations Frameworks and Resolutions

- **UNGA Resolution 55/63:** Sets global principles for combating the criminal use of information technologies.
- The UN is advancing negotiations for a comprehensive global cybercrime treaty, aimed at building on lessons from the Budapest Convention while expanding inclusivity and safeguards for human rights^[4].

C. Regional and Bilateral Arrangements

- **European Union:** Three-pronged approach—alignment of national legislations, new investigative powers, and intensive cooperation frameworks^[5].
- **African Union Convention (Malabo Convention):** Covers harmonization, information sharing, and mutual assistance.
- **Arab League Convention:** Focuses on joint procedures for investigations and mutual assistance.

3. MECHANISMS FOR INTERNATIONAL LEGAL COOPERATION

A. Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties (MLATs)

- Enable countries to request and provide evidence, support investigations, and freeze or seize assets^{[3][6]}.
- MLAT requests can face delays due to differences in legal systems and bureaucracy, which is difficult when digital evidence is volatile.

B. Extradition Treaties

- Allow for the transfer of accused persons between countries but require dual criminality (the act must be illegal in both jurisdictions) and respect human rights obligations^{[3][6]}.
- Extradition is often slow and complicated for cyber offences, especially if countries lack relevant treaties.

C. 24/7 Networks and Real-Time Response

- **Interpol's I-24/7** and the Budapest Convention's network of national contact points permit urgent cross-border communications and evidence preservation^[2].
- Collaboration between Computer Emergency Response Teams (CERTs) and Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRTs) enhances information exchange.

D. Other Mechanisms

- **Letters Rogatory:** Judicial requests across borders used when no treaties exist, though the process is slower.

Graph 2: Process Flow—International Mutual Legal Assistance in Cybercrime

[image:2]

Visualizes the stepwise progression for an MLA request: submission, review, execution, and feedback, highlighting procedural bottlenecks.

4. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

- **Divergent Laws:** Lack of legal harmonization leads to safe havens and obstructs cooperation^{[3][7][5]}.
- **Jurisdictional Issues:** Disputes over which country has authority, especially for cloud-based data or transnational networks.

- **Resource Gaps:** Many nations, especially developing countries, lack technical expertise and resources for cybercrime investigations.
- **Procedural Delays:** Slow formal cooperation mechanisms contrast with the rapid pace at which digital evidence can disappear or be altered.
- **Human Rights Concerns:** Data sharing and investigatory requests must comply with privacy, due process, and proportionality requirements.

Table 1: Common Obstacles in International Cybercrime Cooperation

Obstacle	Impact
Lack of Harmonization	Inconsistent definitions, safe havens
Bureaucratic Delays	Loss of volatile evidence
Resource Inequality	Limited response in low-capacity nations
Sovereignty Concerns	Refusal of cooperation, data localization
Human Rights Safeguards	Rejection of overbroad requests

5. Recent Developments and Trends

- **Global Treaty Negotiations:** UN process to expand on the Budapest model, increase inclusiveness, and address new threats^[4].
- **Public-Private Partnerships:** Growing collaboration between law enforcement and technology companies to monitor, detect, and prevent attacks.
- **Capacity Building:** International support for developing countries to improve laws, infrastructure, and expertise^{[7][8]}.
- **Technological Innovations:** Use of AI and big data analytics in cross-jurisdictional investigations.
- **Fast-Track Data Requests:** Pilots for streamlined procedures, including electronic evidence exchanges within hours or days (vs. months).

Graph 3: Map of Participation in International Cybercrime Treaties (2025)

[image:3]

Shows country-by-country adoption of major treaties, highlighting the global reach of the Budapest Convention and regional agreements.

CONCLUSION

Cybercrime's borderless nature necessitates robust, harmonized, and responsive international legal cooperation. While major progress has been achieved—notably through the Budapest Convention and UN initiatives—challenges remain due to legal divergence, procedural inefficiency, and uneven capacity across countries. Future progress depends on wider treaty adoption, expedited cooperation mechanisms, and balance between efficient crime-fighting and human rights protection.

Best Practices

- Accelerate harmonization of substantive and procedural cybercrime laws.
- Expand and enhance 24/7 contact points for swift response.
- Foster collaboration and trust between countries, private sector, and civil society.
- Invest in technical capacity and training globally.
- Embed human rights safeguards into all international legal cooperation protocols.

MLA Reference Example Above Title

Moreno, Carlos, et al. "Cybercrime and International Legal Cooperation." United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Legal Unit, Services Development and Trade Efficiency Division, 2025.

Citations:

- The Budapest Convention on Cybercrime^{[1][2][3][5][6]}
- UNODC Cybercrime Cooperation Mechanisms^{[3][8]}
- Council of Europe: International Cooperation against Cybercrime^[2]
- Indian Cybercrime Coordination Centre: International Cooperation^[7]
- United Nations Cybercrime Treaty Framework^[4]

Note: The graphs and images described in this article are based on international crime reports, official legal data, and treaty participation statistics compiled from the cited organizational sources.

REFERENCES:

1. https://www.cyberlawconsulting.com/global_cybersecurity_sco_framework.php
2. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/cybercrime/international-cooperation>
3. <https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/cybercrime/module-7/key-issues/formal-international-cooperation-mechanisms.html>
4. <https://www.un.org/en/peace-and-security/basic-facts-about-global-cybercrime-treaty>
5. <https://d-nb.info/119190590X/34>
6. https://www.oas.org/juridico/spanish/cyber/cyb22_coop_handout.pdf
7. <https://i4c.mha.gov.in/international-cooperation.aspx>
8. https://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/CCPCJ/CCPCJ_Sessions/CCPCJ_26/CCCPJ_Res_Dec/CCPCJ-RES-26-4.pdf