

material history of objects; (iii) research on conservation materials and the notions and principles of integrity, compatibility, reversibility and sustainability; and (iv) studies on environmental factors and public involvement. These *regards croisés* (or comparative perspectives) were presented and illustrated through carefully selected case studies which helped foster the discussions.

However, ICCROM learned from the Sharing Conservation Science course that its scope had been too narrow. It became clear that the difficulty of sharing conservation science was symptomatic of a larger issue – the difficulty of sharing conservation decisions in general, and not simply sharing them within our field, but sharing them outside our field. Sharing Conservation Decisions was born.

The Sharing Conservation Decisions course of 2002

“The aim of the course was to explore and expand our understanding of the dynamics and characteristics of decision-making processes in the field of conservation of cultural heritage” (Antomarchi, 2007). While the above statement is true, the unfortunate reality facing us was that there was no obvious decision-making syllabus available. What we did know was that interdisciplinarity remained a foundational principle, that the course also aimed “to bring together experienced professionals from diverse cultural contexts and disciplines to learn and discuss how conservation decisions are made, what influences them and how the process could be improved” (Antomarchi, 2007). The course embraced interdisciplinarity at every level, from the course content to the teaching team to the participants themselves.

Alongside conservators and conservation scientists, the design and teaching teams included art historians, site managers, archaeologists and architects. Although the 2002 design team was limited to only French and Italian sources, subsequent courses incorporated colleagues from China, UK and Brazil.

SCD was open to mid-career professionals from all sectors: conservators of different specializations, conservation scientists, art historians, curators, archaeologists, architects, site or collection managers, and conservation educators. In short, it was open to anyone in our field who routinely faced conservation related decisions. Each group of 18 participants was carefully selected to ensure a wide spread of professional and cultural perspectives. Of course, this would confront participants with many unfamiliar points of view, but it would also lead to their discovery of linkages and even commonalities.

Although the programme’s content evolved over time, results from the meeting in 2000 guided the key themes of interdisciplinarity and values based actions, while the lessons from SCS 2001 guided the