Universal jurisdiction has become an important principle of international law since World War II. It has been recognized in the Geneva Conventions (1949) and over time, this principle has become consolidated and enshrined in other major international conventions such as the Convention Against Torture (1984). It is a powerful tool at the service of international justice, but the specific nature and complexity of these crimes requires States to adopt appropriate legislation and allocate sufficient resources for its implementation. At the EU level, universal jurisdiction is regarded as an important resource and for some of its Member States in particular, as perpetrators of international crimes often decide to migrate to European countries as a way to avoid prosecution in their countries, especially those having a double nationality (e.g. the case of former Head of the Police Force, Erwin Sperisen of Guatemalan/Swiss nationality, condemned in Switzerland to 15 years for murder against inmates in one of the high-security prisons in Guatemala). However, universal jurisdiction has also shown significant difficulties to condemn perpetrators of serious crimes as the proof and testimonies are sometimes difficult to obtain. Furthermore, some legislations are restricting the admission of cases and efforts to discuss international guidelines and the initiative for a multilateral treaty on mutual legal assistance have not yielded concrete outcomes yet. This paper will analyse the challenges in reaching concrete agreements and the implementation of mechanisms for the prosecution of international crimes under universal jurisdiction. It focuses on cooperation at two specific levels, namely the cooperation at EU level and the cooperation at EU and international level. It will draw conclusions on the strengths and weaknesses of the strategies at the two levels, and provide recommendations for further engagement.