



Figure 3. A decision tree for comparing various treatment options for a painting (Michalski and Rossi-Doria, 2011).

particular situation. Strang (2003) provides an example in our field for the processing of electronic records on arrival at an archive (itself a summary of a much larger tree used by large archives).

Tactics for sharing

Sharing what with whom

The authors cited earlier on the failure of sharing decisions all note that defining the groups with which one will share is essential but problematic.

The high-stakes field of global risk governance provides some useful clarification into the types of groups in play. Renn (2005) proposes three main groups: experts, stakeholders, and the public. Experts will consist of specialties. Stakeholders are defined as “socially organised groups that are or will be affected by the outcome of the event or the activity” (p. 49). The third main group is the *non-organized* public, which can be split into “the non-organised *affected* public and the non-organised *observing* public” (p. 49). Finally, there are “the media, cultural elites and opinion leaders” (p. 49).

Renn’s groupings make the failure rate of conservators sharing treatment decisions (Table 1) even worse than we thought, inasmuch as all the successes listed for sharing with ‘museum professionals’ do not count in Renn’s terms, we were just sharing with our own kind – experts.

Renn (2015) subsequently published an overview of sharing techniques for risk governance decisions, well worth reading for applications to our field (and free online). He structures the consultation process around a hierarchy of three ‘challenges’: complexity, uncertainty, and ambiguity (the latter covers our issue of value judgements).