WP1 Work Status Chart (link)
Table 1:WP1 Powers
Item: WP1-3A "Community can require implementation of all Accountability WG Work Stream 2 accountability improvements"

Background:
In December, the CCWG gathered consensus around this proposed rationale for designating Work Streams:

Work Stream 1 is designated for accountability enhancement mechanisms that must be in place or committed to, before IANA transition occurs.

WS1 mechanisms are those that, when in place or committed to, would provide the community with confidence that any accountability mechanism that would further enhance Icann's accountability would be implemented if it had consensus support from the community, even if it were to encounter Icann management resistance or if it were against the interest of Icann as a corporate entity.

All other consensus items could be in Work Stream 2, provided the mechanisms in WS1 are adequate to force implementation of WS2 items despite resistance from ICANN management and board.

Discussion:

In Work Stream 1 the community will acquire review and redress powers, but these may not be sufficient to force implementation of consensus Work Stream 2 accountability improvements. There may be a need for additional community powers to force implementation, or for a commitment from

ICANN to implement a specified list of improvements.

At the time of transition, not all accountability improvements for WS2 will are likely be defined in sufficient detail for ICANN to begin implementation.

For items where implementation detail is sufficient, the CCWG could document these items and secure a commitment from ICANN that it would begin implementation within a specified time period. This commitment would be needed before transition (WS1). The commitment could include a means of enforcing the commitment. Alternative, the community could use its power to remove a board that failed to fulfill its commitment.

For items where implementation details are not known at time transition, we may need a different mechanism. Presumably, those implementation details will be worked-out in a bottom-up consensus process, sometime after the IANA transition.

The community can influence the timing to develop implementation details through its policy development processes and Affirmation Review & Recommendations. After public comment, a PDP or review team recommendation for an accountability improvement is expected to be implemented by ICANN board and management.

Question is, how can the community force ICANN to implement such recommendations? WP1 is already developing a community power to require implementation of AoC Recommendations (WP1-2C). PDP recommendations also carry an obligation for ICANN to implement. But what about recommendations arising outside of the PRP or AoC review processes?

This may indicate a need for a new community power. Should it be strictly confined to the WS2 items about which the CCWG reached consensus, or is this a permanent and more general power?