WE HAVE rates for writing work for clients in the USA, a market that’s well worth a look as, it’s easily five times the size of the UK market. One such rate is for re-use of a 12-year-old article, a reminder of the benefits of keeping your rights if you can.

Thinking about work for a company you’ve not dealt with before? Simply look at the Rate for the Job to find out what companies in similar niches have paid. Then aim higher. You can submit rates online, in confidence, at any time, at www.londonfreelance.org/rates – please give not only the basic rate (e.g. for FBS, First British Serial rights) but extra payments negotiated for extra uses, like the Web – or for print if it’s a Rate for the Online Job. These are shown as (£/€) + 100. We now record rates paid in Euro as well.

Rates marked X are, in the editor’s fallible opinion, below par. Treat all rates as minima, even perhaps the happy ☺.

Photography: Guardian supply photo for website £66 XX; APTW 1 minute footage 50 per cent extra for online use £300 + 150; Financial Times 5 cols £180 + 90; Financial Times online slideshow £130 XX.

Shifts: ITN News producer/director day £322; X; Pearson Education commissioning + development editing, per hour £30; Bookseller layout sub day £140; Oxford Times writing day £100 XX; Daily Mail editorial assistant day £100; Condé Nast Traveller editorial assistant day £80 XXX; Bookseller layout sub day £1401; Daily Mail £400; Insurance Times all rights £360; Express online, 24,000 words on teams, £120.

Words, per 1000: Which £750; Sony Legacy album sleeve notes US$1000; Saturday magazine celebrity column FBS £625; Express FBS £533 + 0; Fabulous FBS £533; Mail on Sunday ‘You’ magazine £500; Aviation Week blog item US$700; Fabulous FBS £400; RBS magazine review £462.50; Daily Mail £400; Insurance Times all rights £360; Express online, 24,000 words on teams, £120.

No-one contributing to a newspaper or magazine or reporting news and current affairs currently has the key rights in UK law.

Like many other areas of the law, there was no practical possibility of stopping the government’s move, not without scuppering the entire Bill and damaging the interests of creators – including journalists in the trial areas for “regional news consortia”. So the CRA wrote to key MPs saying that no authorisations under the Bill should be granted until the moral rights is- sue was sorted out.

That was hard work. Now it gets harder, exorcising the devil in the details. See www.creatorsrights.org.uk/?page=ECL for a guide to extended collective licensing and the next political stages.

Meanwhile in another corner of Westminster, the government’s Intellectual Property Office is taking a look at ‘corporate’ contracts. Yet more consultation.

Over in New York, the Google Books Settlement is delayed again. Anyone with words published in a book should visit www.londonfreelance.org/fl/1002goog.html – our online checklist to work out what the settlement means to you. We’re waiting to see whether the Authors Guild, publishers and Google come up with a second re-vised settlement agreement, as Judge Danny Chin hinted they should at the 18 February fairness hearing. The ranks of those objecting has swelled, with Ursula K. Le Guin resigning from the Authors Guild, and exhorting US authors to join the National Writers’ Union: See www.ursulakleguin.com

And in Washington, DC, the Supreme Court has issued its second ruling in Tasini versus Times – the case in which Jonathan Tasini and others sued the newspaper and online databases for putting freelances’ work online without a licence. The ruling is that the settlement can include authors who did not register their work with the US Copyright Office – including most freelance claimsant. The effect is that the case – launched in 1995 – goes back to the Southern District Court of New York to decide whether the $1 million for writers is fair, or not.

Back in Europe, meanwhile, we await with interest the imminent publication of a draft EU-wide law on authors’ rights. The “Wittem group” of law professors is producing this on its own initiative, with no formal mandate and no consultation. It could be influential, given noises coming from parts of the EU’s civil service, the Commission.
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