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<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>stage of what Newsnight was like as a programme to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>on, what the atmosphere was light, what Peter Rippon was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>like as an editor, how did that work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MS WARK: The programme was -- I think it is actually quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>interesting to look at the kind of physical thing about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>this, because the day team sat at one end of the office,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>with the presenters' office and the editors' office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>side-by-side. The team that would be working on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>investigations and film was at the other end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MS WARK: So therefore, when there were investigations going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>on, of which there are many, that was kept obviously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>quiet, because of the nature of the investigations that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>were happening. So it wasn't a general kind of office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>that everybody knew everything that was going on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MS WARK: Basically, reporting and production teams who were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>working on investigations for example, worked discreetly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>with either the editor or the deputy editor. So when it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>came to general knowledge of what was going on, that was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>not the case by and large with investigation. That's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>very, very important. Because as you would imagine,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>there were certain things that had to be kept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>confidential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Sure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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| 1 | 1 | PROCEEDINGS |
| 2 | 1 | MR POLLARD: Kirsty, thanks for coming along. Just to sort |
| 3 | 1 | of set the scene slightly, we are still in a fairly |
| 4 | 1 | early stage of the interviews. As you can imagine we |
| 5 | 1 | have been looking at a lot of documents. Really, I just |
| 6 | 1 | want to get the questioning going with some general |
| 7 | 1 | observations from you about Newsnight, if we can sort of |
| 8 | 1 | cast our minds back to -- |
| 9 | 1 | MR SPAFFORD: Just a couple of points to make before we |
| 10 | 1 | start. The formal bit, sorry --I have a mouthful of |
| 11 | 1 | sandwich. Just so we're clear, what you say to Nick in |
| 12 | 1 | this session, obviously, is being recorded, and Nick is |
| 13 | 1 | able to make use of what you say in the course of his |
| 14 | 1 | report. It is unlikely he will want to do that, but it |
| 15 | 1 | is very important to be clear. |
| 16 | 1 | MS WARK: As far as I'm concerned, everything is for the |
| 17 | 1 | public record. |
| 18 | 1 | MR SPAFFORD: Obviously what we say to you, please will you |
| 19 | 1 | keep that confidential. |
| 20 | 1 | MS WARK: Absolutely. |
| 21 | 1 | MR SPAFFORD: Thanks very much, back to you Nick. |
| 22 | 1 | MR POLLARD: Really, just to start, if you like, in the |
| 23 | 1 | autumn of 2011, as a sort of scene setter, before the |
| 24 | 1 | Savile story started to unfold, just your sense at that |

---
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| 1 | 1 | MS WARK: Back then I was aware that there was something |
| 2 | 1 | going on with Jimmy Savile, but I had not been keeping |
| 3 | 1 | close eye on it, because that's not my job and I |
| 4 | 1 | wouldn't interfere. |
| 5 | 1 | MR POLLARD: Yes. |
| 6 | 1 | MS WARK: So therefore that was a separate negotiation and |
| 7 | 1 | as far as I knew, that negotiation was between |
| 8 | 1 | Peter Rippon, because it was commissioned when |
| 9 | 1 | Liz Gibbons was on holiday and she was commissioning |
| 10 | 1 | films. It was between Peter Rippon, Meirion Jones and |
| 11 | 1 | Liz MacKean. And that was -- it did not bleed out to |
| 12 | 1 | the rest of Newsnight. |
| 13 | 1 | MR POLLARD: It is fair to say you are a Newsnight veteran. |
| 14 | 1 | At that stage, how many days a week would you be in the |
| 15 | 1 | office? |
| 16 | 1 | MS WARK: My contract is for 52 days a year, because Review |
| 17 | 1 | went to Glasgow, so therefore I couldn't double my days, |
| 18 | 1 | so I'm in Glasgow more. So I'm in one or two days a week, |
| 19 | 1 | some weeks I'm not in at all. So I'm in one or two days a week. |
| 20 | 1 | MR POLLARD: You obviously have a lot of -- again looking |
| 21 | 1 | back at that period -- contact, when you are in, with |
| 22 | 1 | Peter Rippon, I assume. What sort of editor, at that |
| 23 | 1 | stage, did you think he was? You must have worked with, |
| 24 | 1 | what four or five at least -- |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 5</th>
<th>Page 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS WARK:</strong> Four or five editors.</td>
<td><strong>the daily programme be driven by either a deputy editor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR POLLARD:</strong> -- editors? How would you describe him?</td>
<td><strong>or the editor of the day?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS WARK:</strong> He was an editor that came to Newsnight with a kind of -- little experience in television, so he had to get up to speed very quickly and that, but he was a senior journalist.</td>
<td><strong>MS WARK:</strong> The editor of the programme was a late editor. But the editor of the day, I mean they are senior and they are an incredibly strong journalistic team on Newsnight. So he was not, as you would not expect, him to be very involved on the day to day basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR POLLARD:</strong> Sure.</td>
<td><strong>MR POLLARD:</strong> Okay. Did you have much or anything to do with Meirion Jones and Liz MacKean on a day to day basis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS WARK:</strong> He worked well with his deputies. I would say that his deputies, Liz Gibbons and Sharminda Nahal were incredibly important to him.</td>
<td><strong>MS WARK:</strong> Not on a day to day basis, but of course Meirion is one of the most senior journalists on the programme. So therefore he often is involved in investigations. I mean, his triumph was [redacted] and that was very, very important for the programme. But, you know, he -- very rarely worked &quot;on the day&quot;. He was very much involved in his own digging and investigation in order to turn up stories. Now he didn't do Mark Stone, but Newsnight has this tremendous track record of doing investigation, with the undercover cop and so forth, and indeed the child abuse in Wales. Part of the reason I'm here is to say that the culture on Newsnight, whatever you may think about what happened in Savile, is absolutely not one of carelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR POLLARD:</strong> Right. How would you describe his way of editing? What might call the way he led the team, very inclusive, very friendly, outgoing, you will have seen different types of editors, the ones that sort of walked the floor and chewed the fat and so on. Can you sort of paint a picture of how he went about his duties?</td>
<td><strong>MR POLLARD:</strong> Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS WARK:</strong> I mean he let his editors edit on the daily basis. In that way he was neither overbearing nor too reticent. But sometimes I suppose what I would say about that was he -- and on a personal level he was a very, very nice person and I, you know, that is my position about Peter Rippon. And I think that at times he found the job very onerous. And I'm not going to give an opinion about -- <strong>Page 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR POLLARD:</strong> No, no of course.</td>
<td><strong>MS WARK:</strong> They are incredibly well skilled journalists, incredibly well, and I think they are a tremendous team. And this is entirely, so far as I'm concerned, discrete from the rest of the things that go on in Newsnight. <strong>Page 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR BLEASELY:</strong> Just on that point, you said his deputies were very important to him?</td>
<td><strong>MR POLLARD:</strong> It's an interesting point that. Somebody has said -- I think in public -- that one of the things about Newsnight -- I think they are perhaps talking about that time and beyond -- is they have said that there is something of a culture. There was something of a culture of timidity creeping in. I think specifically they were talking about the influence of the editorial policy unit to sort of double check and second-guess stories. Did you get any sense of that at all -- <strong>MS WARK:</strong> I wasn't aware of that -- <strong>MR POLLARD:</strong> Or are you saying the opposite? <strong>MS WARK:</strong> I wasn't aware of that and I never got any sense on Newsnight that there were artificial breaks put on things, or that there was a culture of fear about investigation. I mean the time I came in on the day -- and I was involved editorially on the days that I was in, but I got no sense of holding back. I think there was just proper journalistic endeavours, in which you try to double source everything and so forth. <strong>MR POLLARD:</strong> Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MS WARK: Especially when we look at these other big investigations that have been done that have been successful, and have been fearless, because I was a really difficult investigation. I think that shows that there was not a culture of timidity.

That is different from saying: was there an upward referral more than there had been on previous editors? I don't necessarily think there was. Was there a change after Hutton? There was a change after Hutton of course, but I don't think a programme like Newsnight was adversely affected. I mean, that's our life blood.

MR POLLARD: I was going to ask about referring upwards. I mean the chain of command, I guess, goes from Peter, to Steve Mitchell --

MS WARK: To Helen Boaden.

MR POLLARD: To Helen.

MS WARK: I imagine that any time you wanted you could call in David Jordan. I think that would be a separate strand.

MR POLLARD: Did you get the impression that quite a lot of that happened?

MS WARK: No, I didn't get the impression that a lot of upward referral actually occurred during that time.

I suspect that it would have, but that is only my opinion and I have no knowledge of that.

MR POLLARD: Yes. It has been suggested, I think, during the whole Savile affair unfolding over the past year or so, that one of the reasons why this story might not have run was because it was in some ways not a Newsnight type story. You will have a pretty long memory of Newsnight stories and what are and what aren't Newsnight stories. Do you have a view on whether it was or wasn't?

MR BLAIKELY: I think before you answer that one if you could just describe more generically what is a Newsnight story, as distinct, say, from a Panorama story?

MS WARK: I'm not sure there is a massive distinction between a Panorama and a Newsnight -- in the sense that we do cover a lot of the same territory in different ways. For example, if we were discovering problems -- for example, that's a great story that is out today about the doctor who unnecessarily removed women's breasts. That is the kind of story that we would do and it probably also be the kind of story that Panorama would do. So in that sense, what I would say is: if there is a news story, a news story lasts 30, 40 seconds, lasts two minutes, but something like -- the background into something like, for example, problems at Piper Alpha or what was going on in corruption in a council for example, things that actually we would bring something else to the table, that the endeavour of the producers, assistants producers and reporters, would find out something else. That is what we have. If it is a child abuse story, that is Newsnight territory.

I was involved in an investigation a long time ago, of a woman called Shy, I think it was Shy Smith --

MR POLLARD: Keenan.

MS WARK: Shy Keenan, which was an incredibly important story, which was under Sian Kervill's leadership, which was a very difficult story to do and was very important.

Again, the Irish paedophile story as well. The point about the Shy Keenan story, it, of itself, was only one story of abuse, but it is very, very important that we did that, because it is very, very important that people are seeing that they can actually bring stories to Newsnight and we will take them seriously and investigate. That is a very big point. People should feel that we are a place to come with stories.

MR POLLARD: If you like the celebrity element in that Jimmy Savile story, again the various strands to the way people have reacted this. I have heard it suggested that because it was what you might call, rather crudely, a "celeb exposé", that might make it not a Newsnight story?

MS WARK: That was never my view and it is never my view.
MR POLLARD: No, that's fair enough.

MR BLAKELY: Can I ask: were you aware of the stories in January of this year?

MS WARK: No. No I wasn't.

MR BLAKELY: You noticed no appreciable change in the atmosphere in the office during that period?

MS WARK: No. You see, Meirion was not just working on this. I am sure he was working on lots of different things as well, which we will come on to, I am sure.

MR POLLARD: Yes, indeed.

If you like, the course of events was that through January and February there were sort of some rumblings in the papers, suggestions that the story had been dropped for not proper reasons.

Later in the year, much more currently, the story about the ITV documentary about Jimmy Savile comes out and people had clearly made the connection between what ITV were doing and what Newnight had been investigating as well.

What sort of sense did you get then about the way it was being talked about in the office?

MS WARK: What happened was that after the ITV story went out, and I was down -- I can't remember it was quite soon afterwards and I asked Meirion and Liz to come in, because I needed to be forewarned as to be armed about what might be coming up. Then I got a sense that they were both very agitated. And what my recollection of the conversation was, that they were sure that they had had enough material to go with.

That meeting was the first time I knew that Meirion's aunt was the leader --

MR POLLARD: When you say that meeting, what was the meeting --

MS WARK: I said, "Come on into my office and let's chat about this."

MR POLLARD: Okay.

MS WARK: So we chatted --

MR POLLARD: Meirion and Liz?

MS WARK: Yes, because I didn't know whether we were actually going to do the story ourselves or anything.
received.
2 MR POLLARD: Yes.
3 MS WARK: So I was quite -- that was quite surprising to me
4 that -- and it was -- as I say, it was really unlike
5 Newsnight. Let's just go back to the Shy Keenan --
6 I even read the transcripts of the Shy Keenan
7 interviews, because I wanted to make sure I knew
8 everything. And my sense was that there had been not
9 the same attention to detail in terms of who was reading
10 what transcripts. Who knew what was in what
11 transcripts.
12 MR POLLARD: Do you mean at the time the original story was
13 dropped, as it were?
14 MS WARK: Yes. Then of course that was with -- this is me
15 looking back from what Meirion and Liz and I understood
16 from Peter was that there were -- there were an awful
17 lot of things that hadn't actually been thrashed
18 through.
19 MR POLLARD: Because there was, shall we say, a rather
20 unusual moment, post the ITV programme, when a second
21 interview turned up?
22 MS WARK: Yes.
23 MR POLLARD: Was that a surprise to people?
24 MS WARK: That was a complete surprise. You have to put
25 that in context. That was -- and I know when it was

for the team and it was very important, especially with
the launch of W1, to get them up and to make sure that
they realised that they were all doing, very, very, good
work.
5 MR POLLARD: The launch of W1?
6 MS WARK: Us moving. This all happened as we had been
7 moving to Broadcasting House. So it was very important
8 to keep them -- because, as I say and it was very
9 important that they did not think that they had made
10 mistakes themselves, because, in fact, as I said it was
11 a very discrete group on that investigation.
12 Now, and Peter at that point was, I think -- I think
13 pretty shellshocked to be honest. And there were
14 increasing general conversations -- I had conversations
15 with Peter, where I certainly got the sense -- it's not
16 my opinion, but I got the sense -- that either by
17 accident or design there was a kind of -- not a process
18 of misinformation, but there was just a wee bit of chaos
19 that was not characteristic of Newsnight in those stages
20 of an investigation.
21 MR POLLARD: Do you mean back in the previous year?
22 MS WARK: No, no. I mean about who knew what when.
23 MR POLLARD: Yes.
24 MS WARK: You know. And how much information Meirion had
25 given Peter. How much information Peter thought he had

because it was on the 11th -- I remember it was the
11th -- that went out on the 11th October, because I was
on air -- no, I wasn't on air. I was doing a parallel
programme as an off-air pilot, because we were about to
start the next week.
6 MR POLLARD: Right.
7 MS WARK: So Newsnight is going out. And meanwhile I am at
8 the same time doing an off-air pilot.
9 MR POLLARD: What was that for?
10 MS WARK: For the launch.
11 MR POLLARD: I see, okay.
12 MS WARK: The launch happened -- the launch happened on the
13 15th.
14 MR POLLARD: Yes.
15 MS WARK: I'm doing a pilot in Broadcasting House on the
16 11th, in parallel, so of course I don't see the
17 programme. Then I appear watch it on iPlayer. And
18 there's an interview with [REDACTED].
19 Now as far as I know, she was a pupil at the school.
20 But what I don't understand -- and the other thing was
21 that the editor of the day didn't see that film, because
22 it was being edited up to the wire, I then enquired.
23 Because I thought: where has this interview come from?
24 And what I was told -- and I cannot remember by whom --
25 was that that interview was recorded the previous
Interview with Kirsty Wark

1. November.
2. MR POLLARD: Yes.
3. MS WARK: Right. So what is also weird about that is that
I understood that at the beginning -- by the beginning
of this week, which would be the 8th, or even before,
all the material that Meirion and Liz had was to be
handed over -- I think I'm right in saying, not to
lawyers, but to somebody else in the BBC, maybe the
editorial policy unit, maybe lawyers, I have no idea.
4. MR POLLARD: Yes.
5. MS WARK: So here come an interview which is not
a corroboration of [redacted] in the sense that it was
not another victim. But it was someone who clearly
said, Jimmy Savile came to the home, what would happen
is children would be ushered in for a cup of tea and
Ms Jones would leave. To me that was building up
a picture, but I had never been told about that
interview when I had talked to Meirion and Liz after the
ITV documentary went out. That could just be an
oversight; they could have forgotten.
6. MR POLLARD: Yes.
7. MS WARK: But Peter Rippon specifically said, "I didn't know
about that interview". Which I don't know -- that is
a claim. I don't know whether it is true or not, but
that is what I mean by the fact that it was
classified as not being real and that there was no
involvement from the news department.

November.

1. MR POLLARD: Yes.
2. MS WARK: Now, that interview --
3. MR POLLARD: The interview?
4. MS WARK: Where was it? You probably know that more than
I do at this stage. Where was it languishing? That's
what I don't understand.
5. MR POLLARD: Yes.
6. MR BLAKELY: When you spoke to Meirion and Liz after the ITV
show went out --
7. MS WARK: Yes.
8. MR BLAKELY: -- did you get a sense from them as to how much
had been thrashed out with Peter Rippon the previous
year?
9. MS WARK: No. No, I didn't get a sense of that. It
wasn't -- really the conversation was, look me up to
speed here we may be broadcasting something to
do with this story. Because it was like the middle of
the afternoon or something like that, and obviously
things move very quickly.
10. And of course the decision -- because then the
decision on the week of the 11th -- I was in New York
for the beginning of that week, but I think the decision
on that week was: when is a good time for us to face
this story and do it?
11. So at that stage presumably the production team was
making a decision about when to broadcast it.
12. MR BLAKELY: The limit of what you got from them, at this
point was, "We thought we had enough to stand up
the story, yes it didn't go ahead"?
13. MS WARK: Yes. That was always the line, was they thought
they had enough to stand up. I don't know -- I'm making
an assumption that Liz MacKean looked at transcripts as
well. I'm also making an assumption -- no this is not
an assumption, I know this to be the case, I think that
the interviews with the social networking people
anonymously were not done by Liz, I think. I might be
wrong about that, but I assume that she had seen the
transcripts.
15. Just to knock back to, if you like, the point when
the original enquiry was shelved -- and you may not know
this -- do you get the sense at the time, or immediately
afterwards, that there had been a real battle over it?
16. MS WARK: No, I didn't get that sense. I now know, of
course that -- well, actually, had there been? That's
what I don't know. I can't make it out. I have no
opinion on that, because I don't know whether or not
there was a battle, or whether it was: this is not going
ahead, pull the editing, move off.
17. MR POLLARD: You weren't aware of flames shooting out of
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS WARK:</th>
<th>MR POLLARD:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, and Meirion can be vocal when he wants to -- the thing about Meirion is, you need a Meirion in the office, because he is -- you know, as I say and I often say to Meirion, when it is his investigation, okay, sit down with me, talk to me about what you have got, so I know exactly what is happening here. And he does respond to that.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Are you suggesting that he -- I do not want to categorise what you said unfairly. Does he need restraining a little sometimes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: Are you suggesting that he -- I do not want to categorise what you said unfairly. Does he need restraining a little sometimes?</td>
<td>MS WARK: I don't think &quot;restraining&quot; is the right word at all. Because I don't think he needs restraining. I just need sometimes to do a bit of talk with him. I like doing that with him, because I learn more about it if I do that with him. He doesn't need restraining, we don't want people like Meirion restrained. We just want to make sure they are sure of their ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: He doesn't, if you like, read too much into the evidence that he's gathered?</td>
<td>MS WARK: Well, I don't know what evidence he had actually gathered, you know, beyond what he had. It is clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: You thought she was credible?</td>
<td>MS WARK: I thought she was credible, but, you know, she was one person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS WARK: I thought she was credible, but, you know, she was one person.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: Okay, so back to the time when Newsnight did the story, which must have been quite difficult I imagine, both the timing of it and actually the fact of doing the story, because it is absolutely on your own doorstep.</td>
<td>MS WARK: You are absolutely, you know, eating yourself, as it were.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS WARK: You are absolutely, you know, eating yourself, as it were.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: That was about the time that Newsnight covered it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: That was about the time that Newsnight covered it?</td>
<td>MS WARK: No, no, it was before that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: Was Peter quite involved still?</td>
<td>MS WARK: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS WARK: No.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Or had he stepped aside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: Or had he stepped aside?</td>
<td>MS WARK: He had already been stepped aside from any involvement in any Jimmy Savile material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS WARK: He had already been stepped aside from any involvement in any Jimmy Savile material.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: Yes.</td>
<td>MS WARK: To my knowledge he couldn't even ask Meirion where that interview with had come from. Would I be right in saying that? Because he had to have these Chinese walls at this stage, and of course Meirion was on Panorama at that stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS WARK: To my knowledge he couldn't even ask Meirion where that interview with had come from. Would I be right in saying that? Because he had to have these Chinese walls at this stage, and of course Meirion was on Panorama at that stage.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Yes, yes. The de facto editor at that stage of Newsnight was?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: Yes, yes. The de facto editor at that stage of Newsnight was?</td>
<td>MS WARK: Liz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS WARK: Liz.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Was Liz, his deputy --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: Was Liz, his deputy --</td>
<td>MS WARK: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS WARK: Yes.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: -- who had stepped up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: -- who had stepped up.</td>
<td>MS WARK: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS WARK: Yes.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: And her boss would be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: And her boss would be?</td>
<td>MS WARK: You see that was very tricky. Because there was -- at that point -- I think I'm right if saying both Steve Mitchell and Helen Boaden were involved, and then could not discuss Jimmy Savile. So, I think -- but she had other touchstones that she could deal with, I think. Let me think who was it --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**From the interview that she was clearly making an allegation of abuse.**

3 MR POLLARD: Have you seen that interview?
4 MS WARK: Yes. I've not seen it all, unfortunately.
5 MR POLLARD: You have seen the clips that were used?
6 MS WARK: I have seen what was broadcast, on Panorama.
7 MR POLLARD: What did you think when you saw that?
8 MS WARK: My opinion is. My opinion is that I think you would have to be a very strange kind of masochist to make that up.
9 MR POLLARD: You thought she was credible?
10 MS WARK: I thought she was credible, but, you know, she was one person.
11 MR POLLARD: Yes.
12 MS WARK: Let's be quite clear, she was one person, or we thought --
13 MR POLLARD: Yes.
14 MS WARK: Okay.
15 MR POLLARD: Okay, so back to the time when Newsnight did the story, which must have been quite difficult I imagine, both the timing of it and actually the fact of doing the story, because it is absolutely on your own doorstep.
16 MS WARK: You are absolutely, you know, eating yourself, as it were.
17 MR POLLARD: Peter Horrocks, certainly --
18 MS WARK: Peter Horrocks was there briefly. Fran Unsworth.
19 MR POLLARD: Of course.
20 MS WARK: So she was supported, she was supported.
21 MR POLLARD: But Newsnight did do the story?
22 MS WARK: Newsnight did do the story. As we should do the story.
23 MR POLLARD: Obviously at that stage it was becoming clear, or very shortly afterwards, that Panorama were going to do a programme. What was the first you had heard of that?
24 MS WARK: I can't remember. I think it was on the phone to somebody in the programme or even when I was down at the programme that Panorama were picking up the baton and running with it.
25 MR POLLARD: That was about the time that Newsnight covered it?
26 MS WARK: No, no, it was before that.
27 MR POLLARD: It was before that.
28 MS WARK: It was before that. I am sure it must have been before the 11th, I think, because Panorama got it together quite quickly --
29 MR POLLARD: It was a quick turnaround, wasn't it, to the 22nd, I think?
30 MS WARK: Yes.
MR POLLARD: What did you think when you heard that Panorama were going to do that story, and that Newsnight would figure heavily in that story?
MS WARK: Well it was a legitimate -- it was a legitimate piece of journalism. There is just no question of that.
MR POLLARD: Obviously the people on Newsnight realised that Meirion and Liz were intimately involved with that Panorama programme. What was your view of that? What was the sort of sense in the office?
MS WARK: I mean the sense was that Meirion was away in Panorama and then I think at some point, I think I am right in saying, it was not -- it was a second remove from Panorama again, I think that's what happened. I do not know that is the result of the particular involvement of his aunt, I don't know. Liz MacKean was still working on the programme.
MR POLLARD: Yes.
MS WARK: Now, there is no legitimate reason why she shouldn't be.
MR POLLARD: Yes.
MS WARK: You know. And she wasn't criticising Newsnight per se, she obviously feels very passionately about what happens, but she works on the programme. There is no problem with working on the programme.
MR POLLARD: She didn't seem like somebody who was strongly disgruntled in that period post --
MS WARK: I was not there very much with her, but I think post -- let's be quite clear, she did the film on the

MR BLAKEY: Is there a process for that, in the chain, to bypass, as it were --
MS WARK: That's why I'm thinking. That's -- that's why I'm asking that. Because I'm making the assumption there is. But then, you -- you will have to ask Meirion that.
What Meirion was understanding would be presumably that the process would be Steve, Helen, or would it be David Jordan or -- or did he even think about the fact that it was personally so important to him that you could not let this woman down?
Now that is a thing, because she clearly felt let down.
MR BLAKEY: You don't personally know whether there is a mechanism --
MS WARK: That's what I'm saying. I do not know and it's not an opinion, I'm asking the question.
MR BLAKEY: I'm sorry, you don't know as a matter of BBC practice and a matter of practice whether you can, as it were, circumvent --
MS WARK: I don't. I'm making an assumption even in HR if you have a concern about something, there must be a place you can go.
MR POLLARD: Yes. Those are absolutely questions that we

11th.
MR POLLARD: Yes.
MS WARK: I don't know if she did the interview with or not --
MR POLLARD: Right.
MS WARK: -- the previous November. This is an unknown.
MR POLLARD: Yes.
MS WARK: But I will tell you that interview took everybody on Newsnight by surprise.
MR POLLARD: Yes.
I imagine -- well, the people on Newsnight at that stage inevitably felt a bit embattled, did they, even embattled by their own colleagues on Panorama?
MS WARK: Well, in a sense that was what -- I'm not sure.
I think the very strong sense of the kind of job we had to do to go on air with a great programme, which is what we did when we went to Broadcasting House. And I think it was very important to make sure that they didn't feel embattled, the BBC. It is not -- we were getting obviously a rough ride in the papers, but then you get a rough ride in the papers sometimes, and I just say just keep going and we have done investigations since.
So I absolutely think that the culture on Newsnight has got to be fearless and that is really important and I think the job of the senior team, myself and Jeremy as
well, to make sure that they feel that, that they feel
that they are going to do a good job and not be
embattled by this.
MR POLLARD: A very good point. Did you and Jeremy, if you
like, decide either formally or informally that in the
absence of an editor you would rally the troops a bit --
MS WARK: I did, and Jeremy. We both did a bit, yes, I have
to say, just with a couple of emails. To say, you are
great, get your head down and we're going to do a great
show and that's really important. Because we've come
through a lot more -- you know in a way, all power to
ITV for getting that out there, absolutely all power to
them. And it has been much more important in a sense
than the Newseight, is what the culture has been with
the Savile stuff, but of course your remit is Newseight
and that is absolutely right.
MR POLLARD: Yes. Did you have much to do with this chap,
Mark Williams-Thomas.
MS WARK: I didn't know him.
MR POLLARD: Didn't know him?
MS WARK: No. I didn't even know he existed.
MR POLLARD: No. He was obviously helping Meirion and Liz
on Newseight and I think played a major role in ITV
But you didn't really have any --
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MR POLLARD: Either at the time that the story was dropped
or as, if you like, later when the ITV programme came
about and the detailed explanation started to emerge,
what was your view about whether the investigation had
been dropped for legitimate reasons? And what was the
general view in Newseight?
MS WARK: There was certainly a view in Newseight that --
and I certainly, you know, it was not beyond bounds of
possibility that with these big tribute programmes
coming up there was a nervousness. Whether that
transmitted itself to Peter, I don't know, but it struck
me that the juxtaposition was -- I actually think Peter
actually wrote that or said that to Helen at the time,
something about, you know, this is going to be
difficult for this investigation with the tribute
programmes coming up*

So, you know, to all intents and purposes by that
blog Peter had dropped it for editorial reasons himself.
You know that I have no knowledge to the contrary of
that but it -- it was bound to be a very difficult
time.
MR BLAKEY: Was there any division amongst the team at this
point into camps that thought it was an editorial
decision and camps that thought it was a pressure
decision?
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MR POLLARD: On that point about denuding the team, have you had a sense since -- I think many departments in the BBC have been squeezed and lost staff. Has that been a noticeable thing on Newsnight, that you have fewer resources or fewer people?

MS WARK: I don't -- I think Newsnight is -- I'm not saying it has been protected, but I think that there is a strong team on Newsnight just now. I don't get a sense that we are lacking in kind of serious, grown up journalists.

MR POLLARD: What's your feeling about the way that the BBC has handled this over, shall we say, the past month or so -- I suppose since the ITV programme -- and the ways that statements have emerged and the ways that those have been reported?

MS WARK: This is opinion. I really don't know if I feel like giving this, but I think that the -- my concern was now looking back on it, I think why -- well, two things first of all.

You know, on reflection I think a blog is far too casual a way to put out something as important as this.

So I don't know whose decision it was to get Peter to do the blog. The blog wasn't just -- I understand that Peter showed that blog. He must have before it went out. And I'm not sure I think that a blog was the best plan to be honest, so that's what I think.

MR BLAKELEY: Was the blog something you typically paid attention to?

MS WARK: It was paid attention to outside the BBC --

MR BLAKELEY: Sorry, prior to all this was the blog something that you would have paid particular attention to, the editor's blog?

MS WARK: The editor's blog? Not particularly. I mean, now and then --

MR BLAKELEY: Yes.

MS WARK: But actually for something like this I'm not sure the blog was the right vehicle, because clearly we were dealing with something incredibly difficult and serious and it wasn't just a kind of weekly chat.

MR BLAKELEY: In general terms, was the blog for weekly chats? What was its purpose?

MS WARK: It was just to say what was going on.

MR BLAKELEY: Yes.

MS WARK: Maybe the BBC felt that was the only vehicle that Peter Rippon could use, I don't know. But to me it was -- to me a blog is quite a casual thing.

MR BLAKELEY: It was Peter's blog, was it, rather than there's a team that takes care of it and he signs it off?

MS WARK: No, this was Peter's blog.
MS WARK: So maybe they were unused to each other's styles.
MR POLLARD: Yes.
MR BLAKELY: You said you don't know whether they had
a regular updating kind of relationship where they
touched base --
MS WARK: I don't. I have no idea, you would have to ask
them.
MR BLAKELY: Can you describe their relationship at all?
MS WARK: No. I don't know. I mean, does Meirion -- he's
very ebullient, he brings in investigations, he's good.
I don't know how closely they work or otherwise.
MR BLAKELY: Thanks.
MR POLLARD: I just want to bring you back to the point you
mentioned earlier about Peter's editorship being
onerous on him.
Did he seem to wear the editorship rather heavily?
Did it seem to be difficult for him? Does it seem to be
difficult for him, I should say?
MS WARK: I don't think difficult for him. And he had
a very good year. I mean, after all we won the RTS as
"programme of the year" and he has been very encouraging
of a lot of the staff. I suppose what I mean now is it
was very quickly very clear to me after the ITV
programme that the whole thing was very onerous on him
and that he was suffering a great deal and that he -- on

reflection I think probably it seemed to me that there
were problems with the way the investigation -- with the
team. It was definitely a communications problem
between Meirion, Liz and Peter.
MR POLLARD: Yes.
MS WARK: And that, you know, whether that had -- that
had -- whether that itself had anything to do with the
dropping of the programme or not, I don't know -- the
investigation, I don't know. But it clearly had been
a problem in the preparing of the investigation.
MR POLLARD: Yes, yes.
I'm very happy, Kirsty, thank you for that.
Richard?
MR SPAFFORD: Nothing to add.
MR POLLARD: Anything you wanted to add?
MR BLAKELY: I just have a couple of very short questions.
MS WARK: Yes.
MR BLAKELY: Leaving Savile to one side, just going back to
August 2011 or whenever: how much contact is there
between the Newsnight staff, leaving aside Peter Rippon,
and the next part of them, of the management, with Steve
Mitchell and with Helen Boaden? How much of a day to
day impact do they have on your lives?
MS WARK: Not at all.
MR BLAKELY: Very little or not?

(MS WARK: Not at all. I mean, if there's an issue to be
referred, it's usually -- it would be the deputies or
Peter. The actual -- the day stuff, as it were, or the
general staff, wouldn't have any -- as far as
I understand, but there I'm not there all the time --
any contact with Steve and Helen at all.
MR BLAKELY: Thanks.
MR POLLARD: Kirsty, thank you for that.
MS WARK: A pleasure.
MR POLLARD: Thank you for sparing us the time, particularly
as you are doing the programme tonight.
MS WARK: That's fine.
MR POLLARD: Thank you.
MR SPAFFORD: Thanks, we're done.
(2.52 pm)
(The interview concluded)
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