



VOL. 7 - SPECIAL ISSUE
(2026)

Journal of International Criminal Law

Online Scientific Review

Special Issue
EU-GLOBACT HANDBOOK

EUROCRIMES

EDITED BY

Heybatollah Najandimanesh
Anna Oriolo

ISSN: 2717-1914

www.jiclonline.org

EU-GLOBACT HANDBOOK

EUROCRIMES

A Q&A COMPENDIUM AND STRUCTURAL FRAMEWORKS ON OFFENCES UNDER ARTICLE 83 TFEU

This JICL Special Issue constitutes one of the scientific products the Jean Monnet Module (2023-2026) *Transnational Crime and EU Law: Towards Global Action against Cross-Border Threats to Common Security, Rule of Law, and Human Rights* (EU-GLOBACT) – (Coordinator: Prof. Dr. Anna Oriolo).



Project funded by European Commission Erasmus + Programme – Jean Monnet Action Project number 101126599. Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
VOLUME 7 – SPECIAL ISSUE

FOREWORD

Pages 1-2
Anna Oriolo

EU JUDICIAL COOPERATION IN CRIMINAL MATTERS

Pages 3-9
Anna Oriolo

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Pages 10-30
Luisanna Savino

TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME

Pages 31-39
Alessandra Giordano, Miriana Greco

HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF WOMEN AND MINORS

Pages 40-53
Orsola Ilenia Conte

ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING

Pages 54-65
Emanuela Coppola, Fernanda Masullo



MONEY LAUNDERING

Pages 66-77

Emanuele Sorgente

CORRUPTION

Pages 78-102

Christian Fausto Santoriello

ILLICIT ARMS TRAFFICKING

Pages 103-129

Francesco Potenza

CYBERCRIME (COMPUTER CRIME)

Pages 130-157

Teresa D'Aniello

COUNTERFEITING OF MEANS OF PAYMENT

Pages 158-173

Francesco Focillo

THE VIOLATION OF UNION RESTRICTIVE MEASURES

Pages 174-185

Francesco Focillo



BOARD OF EDITORS

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Heybatollah Najandimanesh, Allameh Tabataba'i University of Tehran (Iran)

GENERAL EDITOR

Anna Oriolo, University of Salerno (Italy)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Mohamed Badar, Northumbria University (United Kingdom)
Flavio de Leao Bastos Pereira, Mackenzie Presbyterian University of São Paulo (Brazil)
Paolo Benvenuti, 'Roma Tre' University of Rome (Italy)
Michael Bohlander, Durham University (United Kingdom)
Homayoun Habibi, Allameh Tabataba'i University of Tehran (Iran)
Charles A. Khamala, The Catholic University of Eastern Africa (Kenya)
Gerhard Kemp, University of Derby (United Kingdom)
Anja Matwijkiw, Indiana University Northwest (United States of America)
Solange Mouthaan, University of Warwick (United Kingdom)

ADVISORY BOARD (REFEREES)

Amina Adanan, Maynooth University (Ireland)
Girolamo Daraio, University of Salerno (Italy)
Ali Garshasbi, AALCO of New Delhi (India)
Noelle Higgins, Maynooth University (Ireland)
Yurika Ishii, Sophia University (Japan)
Kriangsak Kittichaisaree, ITLOS of Hamburg (Germany)
Roxana Matefi, Transilvania University of Braşov (Romania)
Mauro Menicucci, University of Salerno (Italy)
Virginie Mercier, University of Aix-Marseille (France)
Hector Olasolo, Universidad del Rosario of Bogotá (Colombia)
Gizem Dursun Özdemir, Izmir Kâtip Çelebi University (Turkey)
Amar Rouabhi, University of Boumerdes (Algeria)
David Schultz, Hamline University (United States of America)
Eduardo Toledo, International Nuremberg Principles Academy (Germany)
Antonio Vecchione, University of Salerno (Italy)
Mehdi Zakerian, Islamic Azad University of Tehran (Iran)

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

Stefano Busillo (*in-Chief*), University of Salerno (Italy)
Francesco Focillo (*in-Chief*), University of Salerno (Italy)
Helin Ayaz, Izmir Katip Çelebi (Turkey)
Marco Di Donato, University of Verona (Italy)

OVERVIEW

The Journal of International Criminal Law (*JICL*) is a scientific, online, peer-reviewed journal, first edited in 2020 by Prof. Dr. Heybatollah Najandimanesh, mainly focusing on international criminal law issues.

Since 2023 JICL has been co-managed by Prof. Dr. Anna Oriolo as General Editor and published semiannually in collaboration with the International and European Criminal Law Observatory (IECLO) staff.

JICL Boards are powered by academics, scholars and higher education experts from a variety of colleges, universities, and institutions from all over the world, active in the fields of criminal law and criminal justice at the international, regional, and national level.

The aims of the JICL, *inter alia*, are as follow:

- to promote international peace and justice through scientific research and publications;
- to foster study of international criminal law in a spirit of partnership and cooperation with the researchers from different countries;
- to encourage multi-perspectives of international criminal law; and
- to support young researchers to study and disseminate international criminal law.

Due to the serious interdependence among political sciences, philosophy, criminal law, criminology, ethics and human rights, the scopes of JICL are focused on international criminal law but not limited to it. In particular, the Journal welcomes high-quality submissions of manuscripts, essays, editorial comments, current developments, and book reviews by scholars and practitioners from around the world addressing both traditional and emerging themes, topics such as

- the substantive and procedural aspects of international criminal law;
- the jurisprudence of international criminal courts/tribunals;
- mutual effects of public international law, international relations, and international criminal law;
- relevant case-law from national criminal jurisdictions;
- criminal law and international human rights;
- European Union or EU criminal law (which includes financial violations and transnational crimes);
- domestic policy that affects international criminal law and international criminal justice;
- new technologies and international criminal justice;
- different country-specific approaches toward international criminal law and international criminal justice;
- historical accounts that address the international, regional, and national levels; and
- holistic research that makes use of political science, sociology, criminology, philosophy of law, ethics, and other disciplines that can inform the knowledge basis for scholarly dialogue.



The dynamic evolution of international criminal law, as an area that intersects various branches and levels of law and other disciplines, requires careful examination and interpretation. The need to scrutinize the origins, nature, and purpose of international criminal law is also evident in the light of its interdisciplinary characteristics. International criminal law norms and practices are shaped by various factors that further challenge any claims about the law's distinctiveness. The crime vocabulary too may reflect interdisciplinary synergies that draw on domains that often have been separated from law, according to legal doctrine. Talk about “ecocide” is just one example of such a trend that necessitates a rigorous analysis of law *per se* as well as open-minded assessment informed by other sources, e.g., political science, philosophy, and ethics. Yet other emerging developments concern international criminal justice, especially through innovative contributions to enforcement strategies and restorative justice.

The tensions that arise from a description of preferences and priorities made it appropriate to create, improve and disseminate the JICL as a platform for research and dialogue across different cultures, in particular, as a consequence of the United Nations push for universal imperatives, e.g., the fight against impunity for crimes of global concern (core international crimes, transboundary crimes, and transnational organized crimes).

COPYRIGHT AND LICENSING

By publishing with the Journal of International Criminal Law (JICL), authors agree to the following terms:

1. Authors agree to the publication of their manuscript in the JICL;
2. Authors confirm that the work is original, unpublished, and not currently under review elsewhere;
3. The JICL is not responsible for the views, ideas, or concepts presented in the articles; these are the sole responsibility of the author(s);
4. The JICL reserves the right to make editorial adjustments and adapt the text to meet publication standards;
5. Authors retain copyright and grant the JICL the right to first publication. The work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>), allowing the work to be shared with proper attribution and the initial publication in the JICL, provided that:
 - Attribution: you must cite the authorship and the original source of the publication (JICL, URL and DOI of the work); mention the existence and specifications of this license for use; provide a link to the license; indicate if changes were made; do not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits;
 - NonCommercial: you may not use the material for commercial purposes;
 - ShareAlike: if you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original;
6. Authors may enter into additional agreements separately for non-exclusive distribution of the published version of the work (e.g., publishing in an institutional repository or as a book chapter), with proper attribution to the JICL and original publication and after having informed the editors of such distribution.

Transnational Organized Crime

*by Alessandra Giordano and Miriana Greco**

SUMMARY: I. Why Does Transnational Organized Crime Constitute a Structural Threat to Internal Security? – II. Does A Definition of Transnational Organized Crime Exist? – III. Which Criteria Determine the Transnational Nature of an Offense According to the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC)? – IV. What Legislative Instruments Have Been Adopted to Harmonize Cross-Border Core Offenses? – V. What Is the Role of The UNTOC Open Clause in Countering Emerging Crimes? – VI. How Has the Transnational Offense Framework Been Integrated into Domestic Law? – VII. Which Special Investigative Techniques Are Provided by Italian Legislation to Counter Transnational Networks? – VIII. What Is the Structural Difference Between the Historical Institution of Extradition and The European Arrest Warrant (EAW)? – IX. What Role Do Asset Recovery and the Confiscation of Illicit Proceeds Play in the Global Anti-Mafia Strategy? – X. How Do Specialized Agencies Coordinate Field Strategies Through the UNODC Digest?

KEY FINDINGS: Affirmation of Intelligence-Led Policing; Definitional flexibility of the open clause; Inadequacy of isolated responses; Strategic centrality of asset recovery; Transition from a political to a judicial model.

I. Why Does Transnational Organized Crime Constitute a Structural Threat to Internal Security?

Transnational organized crime (TOC) no longer constitutes an emergency restricted within single national borders, but represents a **structural challenge of global interest**, capable of destabilizing the international political and economic order. Modern mafia cartels operate as true **multinational criminal corporations**, equipped with massive financial resources, interconnected logistical structures, and a distinct operational fluidity. This evolution jeopardizes the internal security of the Member States of both **the Council of Europe** and the **European Union**, acting on three destructive levels:

- **Erosion of the Rule of Law:** Through corruption and the systemic intimidation of public institutions, police forces, and the judiciary.
- **Infiltration of the Legal Economy:** The laundering of illicit capital distorts free competition, pollutes healthy commercial markets, and undermines the integrity of the European single market.

* Members of the Secretariat of the International & European Criminal Law Observatory (IECLO), University of Salerno, Italy.

- **Violation of Human Rights:** The use of violence and the exploitation of social vulnerabilities (as seen in trafficking) directly strike the core values protected by the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).

FOCUS

Effects of Digitalization

In the current geopolitical scenario, criminal organizations have capitalized on the structural vulnerabilities and rapid digitalization accelerated by the post-pandemic transition. Transnational cartels have diversified their profit lines, adapting rapidly to global markets. Among the **emerging crimes with high social alarm**, the following are recorded:

- **Structured cybercrimes** and large-scale ransomware attacks against critical infrastructures.
- **Advanced computer fraud** and offenses related to digital identity theft.
- **Environmental crimes (*ecocrimes*)**, with particular reference to the illicit disposal of toxic waste.
- **Transnational commercialization** of counterfeit medicines, vaccines, and medical devices.
- **Illicit trafficking** of precious goods, conflict minerals, and looted artworks.

II. Does A Definition of Transnational Organized Crime Exist?

The doctrinal debate has long struggled to find a unanimous consensus: while traditional Italian doctrine tended to identify the phenomenon exclusively around the rigid criteria of the structured mafia model, the international and Euro-unitarian orientation prefers an **objective and flexible** qualification, suitable for targeting fluid criminal networks that lack a historical or territorial root.

The universal dogmatic synthesis was codified by the **United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime** (known internationally by the acronym UNTOC or as the *Palermo Convention* of 2000), a framework subsequently transposed also within the European Union's **Framework Decision 2008/841/JHA**.

According to Art. 2 of UNTOC an “**organized criminal group**” shall mean a structured group, consisting of **three or more persons**, existing for a period of time and acting in concert with the aim of committing one or more **serious crimes**, punishable by a maximum deprivation of liberty of **at least four years**, in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a **financial** or other material benefit”

To facilitate memorization, the **constitutive elements** established by UNTOC that we must remember are:

- **The numerical criterion:** Presence of a minimum number of **three or more people**.
- **The temporal element:** It must be a structured group that has **existed for a period of time**, excluding mere occasional association for a single offense.
- **The economic purpose:** The ultimate goal of the activity must consist in obtaining **financial or other material benefits**.
- **The gravity threshold:** The common action must be oriented toward the commission of offenses punishable by a maximum reclusion of **not less than four years** (*serious crimes*).

The multilevel regulatory articulation (the governance of the contrast) is composed of:

- **International level (UN):** United Nations Convention (UNTOC 2000). Focus centered on the **global definition of a structured group** and on the establishment of international obligations for incrimination and assisted confiscation.
- **Regional level (Council of Europe):** Recommendation Rec(2001)5. Provides common monitoring standards for national criminal policies and guarantees the constant **balancing of measures with the Human Rights** of the ECHR.
- **European level (European Union):** Framework Decision 2008/841/JHA. Introduces the **harmonization of minimum criminal penalties** within the area of freedom, security, and justice, activating the **EMPACT** operational platform.
- **National level (Italy):** National System (Law 146/2006). Implements the transposition of treaties by introducing the legal figure of the **Transnational Offense** and coordinating it with the special offense of mafia association *ex Art. 416-bis* of the Criminal Code.

III. Which Criteria Determine the Transnational Nature of an Offense According to the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC)?

The notion of **transnationality** is fundamental. It does not simply coincide with the physical crossing of a geographical border by the offender but invests the entire **logistical and executive planning** of the criminal action. It is the ascertainment of this cross-border dimension that legitimizes the activation of international cooperation instruments. According to para. 2 of the provision, an offense is transnational in nature if:

- It is committed in more than one State;
- It is committed in one State but a substantial part of its preparation, planning, direction or control takes place in another State;
- It is committed in one State but involves an organized criminal group that engages in criminal activities in more than one State; or
- It is committed in one State but has substantial effects in another State.

CASE STUDY

Italian Cassation Court, Judgment No. 4307, 2024

“For the purpose of configuring the aggravating circumstance of transnationality, it is indispensable to ascertain that the offense was planned, facilitated, directed, or consummated, at least in a relevant or substantial part, abroad, requiring a causal link between transnationality and the activity of the organized group.”

With this fundamental ruling, the Italian Supreme Court of Cassation clarified the boundaries of national jurisdiction by examining a case of cross-border commercial fraud. The judges ruled that transnationality requires **rigorous evidentiary verification** regarding the logistical elements located across the border. This interpretative strictness has the practical effect of **preventing the pretextual or automatic use of the aggravating circumstance** for entirely domestic crimes, safeguarding the principle of specificity in criminal law.

IV. What Legislative Instruments Have Been Adopted to Harmonize Cross-Border Core Offenses?

Differences between the criminal codes of various States historically represent the main obstacle to the effectiveness of investigations. The universal regulatory pillar to overcome

this fragmentation is the **United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC)**, adopted by the General Assembly on November 15, 2000, through Resolution 55/25.

UNTOC operates by imposing on signatory States the **mandatory introduction** into their respective domestic criminal laws of **four core offenses**:

1. **Participation** in an organized criminal group (Article 5).
2. **Laundering** of proceeds of crime (Article 6).
3. **Corruption** of public officials (Article 8).
4. **Obstruction of justice** (Article 23).

FOCUS

The Supplementary Protocols to the UNTOC

The UNTOC Convention is structurally integrated by **three targeted Protocols**:

- **Protocol on Trafficking in Persons**: Centred on the prevention, suppression, and punishment of the exploitation of human beings, with particular attention to the protection of women and children, and on the international protection of victims (in force since December 25, 2003).
- **Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea, and Air**: Aimed at targeting the facilitation of illegal immigration managed for profit by trafficking networks (in force since January 28, 2004).
- **Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts, Components, and Ammunition**: Adopted through Resolution 55/255 to facilitate cross-border tracking and the exchange of ballistic data (in force since July 3, 2005).

The **Council of Europe** intervenes in this scenario by integrating the repressive dimension with that of the **protection of fundamental rights**, guaranteeing through the jurisprudence of the **ECtHR** that special anti-mafia regulations do not violate the guarantees of a fair trial (**Article 6 ECHR**) or the right to property (**Article 1, Protocol 1 ECHR**) in cases of seizure.

V. What Is the Role of The UNTOC Open Clause in Countering Emerging Crimes?

The intrinsic strength of UNTOC lies in its nature as a “**living treaty**” capable of evolving. The authors of the UN Convention deliberately chose not to insert a rigid and closed list of punishable offenses, because criminal markets and technologies change with extreme rapidity.

The Convention applies to an open list of emerging crimes thanks to the **general clause** contained in **Art. 2, letter b) of UNTOC**, which defines a “**serious crime**” as any offense punishable by a maximum deprivation of liberty of **at least four years**. This flexible extension covers today:

- **Cybercrime**, supporting the cross-border acquisition of digital evidence.
- **Environmental crime**, aimed at countering the illicit trafficking of hazardous waste and protected species.
- **International trafficking of cultural property** and the falsification of medical and healthcare products.
- Offenses related to **international terrorism**, where funding through mafia channels is established.

Thanks to this mechanism, resolutions of the **Conference of the States Parties (COP)** can constantly extend the application of UNTOC's assistance tools (such as extradition and mutual assistance) to emerging phenomena of computer crime and *ecocrimes* without having to draft new treaties.

VI. How Has the Transnational Offense Framework Been Integrated into Domestic Law?

Italy gave full execution to the Palermo Convention through **Law No. 146 of March 16, 2006**. The national legislator made a precise technical choice: it did not create an autonomous figure of crime called a “transnational felony” but configured transnationality as a **common aggravating circumstance with special effect**.

The **four pillars** of **Law 146/2006** that we must memorize are:

- **The internal definition (Article 3):** An offense is transnational if it is punishable by reclusion of no less than four years in its maximum, committed by an organized criminal group, and involves more than one State.
- **The special aggravating circumstance (Art. 4, today Art. 61-bis of the Criminal Code):** Entails a mandatory increase of sentence **from one-third to one-half** for crimes committed by taking advantage of or in order to facilitate a transnational organized group.
- **Liability of Entities (Legislative Decree 231/2001):** Art. 10 of Law 146 inserts transnational offenses into the catalogue of core offenses that generate **administrative and patrimonial liability for corporate companies**.
- **Extension of anti-mafia protections:** Investigations for crimes aggravated by transnationality are delegated to the exclusive competence and special investigative functions of the **District Anti-Mafia Directorate (DDA)**.

CASE STUDY

Italian Cassation Court, Second Penal Section, Judgment No. 27379, 2023

“The special aggravating circumstance of transnationality, provided by Art. 61-bis of the Criminal Code, has an objective nature and extends to co-conspirators who had knowledge of it or who ignored it through negligence, regardless of an actual conviction for the primary associative offense.”

The Supreme Court addressed a case concerning the international smuggling of manufactured tobacco managed by a cell operating between Eastern Europe and Italy. The defense argued that the aggravating circumstance was inapplicable because the defendant was external to the main criminal association. The judges of legitimacy rejected the appeal, ruling that **transnationality applies to the single specific crime** provided the co-conspirator was fully aware that they were facilitating a structured organization operating on an international scale.

VII. Which Special Investigative Techniques Are Provided by Italian Legislation to Counter Transnational Networks?

Traditional reactive investigation tools are ineffective against criminal organizations protected by sophisticated encrypted communication systems and jurisdictional barriers. For this reason, the Italian system, transposing the provisions of Art. 20 of the UNTOC Convention, has codified exceptional instruments of procedural derogation.

Article 9 of Law 146/2006 establishes a special **cause of justification** (non-punishability) for judicial police officers who perform acts that would abstractly constitute an offense, for the sole purpose of acquiring stable evidence. The special investigative techniques permitted by Art. 9 are:

- **Undercover Operations:** Controlled infiltration of State agents into criminal networks to acquire evidence and information from within the clans. The acts performed by the agents (such as simulating the purchase of weapons or drugs) are protected by a cause of exclusion of criminal liability.
- **Controlled Deliveries:** Provide for the deferral of the seizure of illicit goods, narcotic substances, or counterfeit currency. Through the constant monitoring of the transit of shipments across national borders, the objective shifts from secondary couriers to identifying the real leaders and final destinations of the network.

FOCUS

Operational Derogations *ex* Art. 9 Law 146/2006

The two operational techniques allow the judicial police to act proactively. Delaying the seizure or the arrest of couriers (*delayed seizure*) is the fundamental tool to avoid the premature interruption of a cross-border investigation, guaranteeing the collection of stable legal evidence usable in trial against the leaders located abroad.

VIII. What Is the Structural Difference Between the Historical Institution of Extradition and The European Arrest Warrant (EAW)?

The study of the evolution of mechanisms for surrendering wanted persons highlights the transition from an ancient system of diplomatic relations to a modern model of integrated judicial cooperation.

The comparative analysis articulates around two diametrically opposed models:

- **Traditional Extradition:** Qualifies historically as an **act of sovereignty and political courtesy** between States. The procedure is cumbersome, suffers from long execution times, and is dominated by the **discretionary filter of the Executive Power** (Ministry of Justice), which can refuse the surrender of the wanted person to safeguard national political interests. Legal nature: Act of courtesy and political sovereignty between sovereign States. Transmission channel: Diplomatic and ministerial, with strong government discretion. Operational characteristics: Complex, cumbersome procedure characterized by long timeframes.
- **The European Arrest Warrant (EAW):** Introduced by **Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA**, completely erases the political filter and configures itself as an **enforceable judicial decision** based on the cornerstone principle of **mutual recognition**. The exchange takes place directly and exclusively between the judicial authorities (Prosecutor's Offices and Courts of Appeal) of the Member States of the European Union, within **strict mandatory time limits** (maximum 60 days). Legal nature: Directly enforceable judicial decision within the common legal area. Transmission channel: Direct judicial channel between Prosecutor's Offices and Courts of Appeal, without political filters. Operational characteristics: Standardized, simplified procedure characterized by distinct rapidity.

CASE STUDY

Court of Justice of the European Union, C.J., 2025

“The execution of a European arrest warrant may not be refused except for reasons exhaustively provided for. However, the executing judicial authority must decide to postpone the surrender if there is a real risk of violation of Art. 4 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights related to the conditions of detention in the issuing Member State.”

Court of Justice of the European Union, *Rugu* and *Aucroix*, 2026

In the cases of *Rugu* and *Aucroix* of June 2026, the Court of Justice had to resolve a conflict between the obligation of rapid surrender of an organized crime broker and the protection against degrading treatment. The Court ruled that the executing State must urgently request supplementary information from the issuing State and, only in the absence of suitable guarantees on the prison regime, may postpone the surrender, **balancing the principle of mutual recognition with the fundamental rights of the person.**

IX. What Role Do Asset Recovery and the Confiscation of Illicit Proceeds Play in the Global Anti-Mafia Strategy?

Modern criminology highlights how transnational organized criminal groups are driven by a single motivation: the accumulation of economic profit and the **accumulation of wealth**. Consequently, the penal sanction of imprisonment is insufficient if not accompanied by the **financial dismantling of the clan**. Confiscation transforms from a mere additional penalty into a **strategic preventive tool**.

REFERENCES

UNTOC, 2000, Art. 12 and Art. 13

“Each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary to enable confiscation of proceeds of crime derived from offenses covered by this Convention or property the value of which corresponds to that of such proceeds, as well as property, equipment or other instrumentalities used in or destined for use in the commission of offenses.”

The Italian system stands at the global forefront in this sector, having implemented – in harmony with Art. 11 of Law 146/2006 – the institution **of value confiscation (confiscation by equivalent)**. If it is not possible to trace the direct and specific profit of the transnational offense, the judge orders the seizure and confiscation of sums of money, movable or immovable property, or other assets of a **value proportional to that in the offender’s availability**, directly targeting the personal assets accumulated unlawfully.

X. How Do Specialized Agencies Coordinate Field Strategies Through the UNODC Digest?

Institutions coordinate their action on the field by combining doctrinal analysis with operational activity. Following the recommendations issued by the Conference of the States Parties to UNTOC in 2010, Italy led the drafting of the **“Digest of Organized Crime Cases”** (published in collaboration with UNODC in 2012). The Digest empirically demonstrated that international investigations succeed only if action focuses on the **structural dismantling of the network**, rather than on the single specific crime.

FOCUS

“Operation Giotto” Investigation

Italian investigation conducted by the Carabinieri (UNODC reference classification: **ITA18**).

- **Legal issue:** Ascertain the existence of a single transnational associative structure with a top-down and polycentric character, capable of operating in Italy, France, Spain, and Germany for the production and commercialization of counterfeit banknotes.
- **Applied law:** Art. 416 of the Criminal Code coordinated with the aggravating circumstance of transnationality *ex* **Art. 3 of Law 146/2006** and the use of special investigative techniques of **Art. 9** of the same law.
- **Operational analysis:** The investigation proved that the 11 territorial cells constituted a true criminal consortium. Investigators monitored financial flows across borders, exchanging data in real time with the involved foreign authorities, bypassing national barriers through **Europol** (criminal intelligence analysis), **Eurojust** (prosecutorial coordination), and **OLAF** (fight against customs fraud).
- **Judicial outcome:** Dismantling of the cartel, arrest of over 170 people including top leaders, and seizure of massive illegal printing facilities. Inserted in the UNODC Digest as an operational model for coordinated investigations.

The general summary matrix (alignment for proceedings) in synthesis is:

- **Global cooperation: UNTOC Convention (Palermo 2000).** Structural identification of the organized group. It constitutes the legal basis for extending enforcement to modern cybercrimes and ecocrimes.
- **Italian transposition: Law 146/2006.** Aggravating circumstance of transnationality and targeted reforms to the Criminal Code. Extension of special powers and attributions of the District Anti-Mafia Prosecutor.
- **Case analysis: UNODC Digest (Giotto Case).** Study of a structured network with a hierarchical and consolidated character. Key example of coordinated investigations between foreign police forces.
- **Intelligence exchange: EU - INTERPOL Partnership.** Interoperability of security databases. Direct access through the European portal to global databases **SLTD** (stolen documents) and **TDAWN** (capture alerts).

FOCUS

The EMPACT Operational Cycle (2026-2029)

Based on the conclusions adopted by the Council of the European Union, the new permanent **EMPACT cycle for the period 2026-2029** directs investigative efforts toward the dismantling of high-risk criminal networks in Europe, known as **Most Threatening Criminal Networks and Individuals (MCTNI)**. This approach funds joint operational actions (*Action Days*) to counter high-priority crimes, such as environmental crime and human trafficking. In support of these measures, the European Union utilizes the **Internal Security Fund (ISF) for the period 2021-2027**, aimed at improving information sharing, intensifying cross-border cooperation, and elevating national technological capabilities of police forces in detecting computer and cryptographic traces.

The operational and financial architecture of the European Union in this area is made up of:

- **The EMPACT Operational Platform (Operational Cycle 2026-2029):** Scope of action: Implementation of field strategies based on the *Intelligence-led policing* model. Priority focus: Targeted dismantling of high-risk networks (**MCTNI**) and

execution of coordinated *Action Days* on environmental crimes, trafficking, and counterfeiting.

- **The Internal Security Fund (ISF) Financial Instrument (Period 2021-2027):** Information Sharing: Financial support for the interoperability of data systems of European agencies. *Cross-Border Cooperation:* Logistical funding for the establishment and mobility of **Joint Investigation Teams (JIT)**. *Capacity Building:* Funds allocated for the purchase of software and specialized forensic technical training to decrypt digital traces and cryptocurrencies used by clans.

XI. Key Findings

The scientific analysis carried out within this paper leads to the outline of **five fundamental findings** that we must assimilate for a complete understanding of the phenomenon:

- **Inadequacy of isolated responses:** Transnational organized crime (TOC) acts on the market as a structured and de-localized network. Consequently, the isolated action of a single State is anachronistic and ineffective. Countering it necessarily requires **integrated multilevel cooperation** between the UN, the Council of Europe, the European Union, and individual national criminal systems.
- **Definitional flexibility of the open clause:** Based on the architecture of the UNTOC Convention, the effectiveness of assistance tools is not bound to a rigid catalogue of offenses. On the contrary, the use of the clause of *serious crimes* (offenses with a maximum penalty of four years or more) allows for the immediate extension of protections and coordinated investigations to emerging technological threats, such as **cybercrimes** and **environmental crimes**.
- **Transition from a political to a judicial model:** The evolution of mechanisms for surrendering wanted persons demonstrates the success of the principle of **mutual recognition**. The transition from traditional extradition (cumbersome and dominated by the political discretion of governments) to the **European Arrest Warrant (EAW)** has judicialized the exchange between Prosecutor's Offices, reducing surrender times to a strict maximum of 60 days.
- **Strategic centrality of asset recovery:** Modern anti-mafia strategies go beyond the logic of mere custodial sanctions, focusing on the economic principle of *follow the money*. Targeting illicit wealth through proactive measures and advanced institutions such as **value confiscation** constitutes the most effective preventive tool to block the destabilization of healthy commercial markets.
- **Affirmation of Intelligence-Led Policing:** European strategic lines of action are shifting toward proactive prevention. Through the interoperability of security databases and the **EMPACT** operational cycle, the common effort is no longer aimed at fragmentarily striking the single crime, but at **systematically dismantling high-risk criminal networks (MCTNI)** operating in the Euro-unitarian area.