

Market Visibility Framework

Evidence quality and accountability

Consultation submission | Corey Foggo | 13 October 2026
Non-confidential

Scope

I am the founder of Mycelium Resource Intelligence, an early-stage evidence and provenance prototype using public and synthetic data. This contribution concerns information quality and accountability. It does not claim operational grid validation or propose a software procurement.

Question 2: useful visibility information

Define a proportionate common evidence record: resource or portfolio identity; observation, forecast or declared intent; units, interval and time zone; source and method version; submission time; uncertainty; and limitations. Make missing, stale and conflicting data explicit. Preserve any baseline method and revision. Specify which data-quality failures trigger exclusion, reduced reliance or human review; missing data must not silently become zero response.

Question 5: clear responsibility

Identify who supplies, corrects and maintains each record, including when an operator, aggregator and retailer hold different parts of the evidence. Document authority and correction routes. Reuse established channels and align definitions to avoid duplicate reporting.

Question 7: test before imposing obligations

Support staged trials against existing forecasting practice, with pre-specified success and failure criteria. Measure forecast error by horizon, data coverage, latency, uncertainty calibration and participant cost, including stress events. Test late data, conflicting forecasts, revisions and coordinated responses. Retain the information available at decision time. Subsequent corrections should remain traceable; changed dependencies should flag affected conclusions for re-review.

Question 10: interoperable, practical provision

Publish versioned machine-readable schemas, worked examples and conformance tests, with a practical route for smaller participants. Use existing interfaces where suitable. Give submissions unique identifiers and acknowledgement states that distinguish receipt, validation and operational use; manage duplicate retries and corrections explicitly. Set reporting frequency by need and cost. Visibility information must not be confused with a dispatch instruction or commitment.

Question 13: demonstrate consumer value

Evaluate forecast improvements, operational usefulness, implementation and ongoing costs, and distribution of benefits and burdens. Compare intended with observed behaviour while accounting for constraints, overrides and rebound effects; do not assume every deviation is non-compliance. Publish accessible aggregate findings and review criteria. Protect household privacy and commercially or security-sensitive details, with controlled access for authorised review.

International implementation lessons

NIST SP 1108r4 emphasises interoperability profiles and testing. ENTSO-E publishes standardised data-exchange and acknowledgement models. These support considering tested exchange profiles and clear receipts in Australia; they do not establish legal applicability or require importing European obligations. No confidentiality is requested.

Reference: AEMO September 2026 consultation paper. Question numbers refer to that paper.

International references: NIST SP 1108r4 (2021); ENTSO-E EDI Library. Implementation references, not Australian legal requirements.