Azerbaijan has still not fixed the deficiencies in its IPR laws or met its other enforcement commitments under the 1995 U.S.-Azerbaijan Trade Agreement (which entered into force on April 21, 1995). The U.S. Government should continue to seek Azerbaijan’s full compliance with these obligations.

The current Azerbaijani Copyright Law (October 23, 1996) has many deficiencies which need to be corrected in order to bring the country into compliance with the Berne Convention (which Azerbaijan joined in 1999) and the Geneva Phonograms Convention (which it joined in 2001). Effective April 11, 2006, Azerbaijan acceded to the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT). IIPA continues to oppose the eligibility of Azerbaijan to enjoy General System of Preferences (GSP) trade benefits until the Government of Azerbaijan addresses the legal reform deficiencies noted below (see letter of IIPA to U.S. Government, December 3, 2004).

Legal reform deficiencies: The legal reforms that Azerbaijan must address are:

1) Adoption of clear and explicit provisions into the Copyright Act of 1996 (or by adoption of a government decree) to provide protection for pre-existing works (pre-1999) or sound recordings (pre-2001) – required for compliance with the bilateral Trade Agreement, Berne, and the WTO TRIPs Agreement.
2) Adoption of provisions to provide civil ex parte search provisions – required by Article 50 of the WTO TRIPs Agreement.
3) Adoption of the following changes to strengthen criminal enforcement:
   a. A “significant amount of use criteria” that is calculated on the basis of the price of legitimate product, instead of the existing “significant harm” criteria found in Article 158 of the Azerbaijan Criminal Code (2000) for copyright and neighboring rights criminal violations;
   b. Lowering the respective amount for the threshold to commence liability under Article 158 of the Azerbaijan Criminal Code (2000) for copyright and neighboring rights criminal violations;
   c. Similarly changing the “significant amount criteria” (as in (a), above) in the Code of Administrative Misdemeanors (Article 186-1) and eliminating any threshold for administrative violations which is currently ten times the minimum monthly wages; and
   d. Providing for the confiscation and destruction of equipment used for pirate production of copyright and neighboring rights materials.
4) Adoption into the Criminal Code and/or the Criminal Procedures Code of the proper ex officio authority for the police to commence criminal IPR investigations and cases.
5) Adoption (or the clarification, in Article 19, if it already exists) into the Customs Code of the proper ex officio authority for customs officials to seize material at the border and to commence criminal IPR investigations and cases.
6) Adoption of all the necessary provisions for Azerbaijan to fully implement the WCT and WPPT, since it acceded to those treaties in 2006.
7) Creation of an Inter-Ministerial committee consisting of police, prosecutors, and customs officials charged with IPR enforcement, to coordinate enforcement activities.

Enforcement deficiencies: Azerbaijan is, at present, not providing “adequate and effective” enforcement as required under its bilateral and multilateral obligations. There is no meaningful police, customs, or prosecutorial activity, as required by the bilateral Trade Agreement and the WTO TRIPs Agreement. As noted, the administrative sanctions (Article 186-1) provide for fines of 20 times the minimum monthly wages for copyright infringements, but these fines are only imposed if the infringement causes damages that equal more than ten times the minimum monthly wage. In 2006, there were no known cases in Azerbaijan imposing either an administrative sanction or a criminal penalty for an IPR violation, including a neighboring rights violation. In 2005, the last year when piracy rate estimates were calculated, the recording industry estimated piracy levels at 80% overall, and over 90% for international repertoire.

Cases regarding copyright violations brought on behalf of Azerbaijani rightholders are usually considered in civil courts. There were no reports of any IPR materials, including audio products, being seized during the past year. There are no reports of any optical disc plants operating in Azerbaijan.