

Workshop summary: Inverter Based Resources Retuning Workshop 16 July 2026

- The workshop focused on the potential role of plant retuning to address system strength issues. The aim was to gather and test stakeholder views on the barriers to retuning in different potential scenarios, to inform our work as part of the *Security framework enhancements* rule change package.
- Stakeholders requested clarification from the outset on whether the scope of the work was limited to only IBR retuning for system strength. It was suggested that the AEMC should consider synchronous generator retuning as well.

Key discussion topics:

- **Participant incentives vary between retuning scenarios:** Workshop attendees discussed how incentives to participate depend on the costs and benefits to individual participants. Different scenarios create different incentives, and participation could be encouraged through aligning these incentives.
- **Voluntary vs. mandatory retuning:** There was strong interest in whether retuning should be voluntary or mandatory. Stakeholders discussed how incentives and risks could be managed under either approach.
 - Voluntary retuning would enable plant owners to opt out of retuning. This approach may create coordination challenges when the retuning of several plant is required to achieve system security outcomes, and result in a sub-optimal outcome if not all parties agree to participate.
 - Mandatory retuning would encourage retuning to be used in a wider range of scenarios but would need to be coupled with an avenue for dispute resolution for when retuning conditions are unreasonable. Participants also noted that mandatory retuning may impact investment certainty for projects that had been financed based on existing obligations and assumptions.
- **Technical & operational challenges:** Retuning can be resource-intensive, and participants in the workshop highlighted some practical challenges that should be considered in any retuning reforms. These included considering the extensive modelling, testing and validation requirements and OEM obligations (e.g. warranty, project certification). Discussion also explored the degree of ongoing responsibility borne by the plant owner for retaining and maintaining information necessary to undertake retuning.
- **Compensation:** Plant owners noted that some scenarios would require commensurate compensation for the costs incurred by the retuning process and the benefit that their actions bring. Participants had a range of views on whether compensation for reasonable costs should include both direct and indirect costs.



- **Trigger for retuning and cost-benefit analysis:** Stakeholders questioned the driving force behind retuning, whether it be NSP initiated to meet system strength obligations or a security directive from AEMO. Discussion touched on the role of retuning in system strength RIT-T processes. Network service providers noted that current settings are focused on retuning for performance standards and power transfer capability, and emphasised that they would need to do significant scoping work before they could quantify the improvement and build an economic case.

Participants highlighted their preference for retuning to be conditional on a demonstrated system strength issue and clear evidence-based net benefits.

- **Process & compliance:** Some stakeholders raised concerns about the NER clause 5.3.9 processes for settings changes and the risk of reopening other GPS clauses. Other attendees noted that the recently published 5.3.9 guidelines and fact sheet clarifies that the assessment/re-negotiation is fit for purpose and commensurate to the change.

Next steps:

- The AEMC will continue developing its draft determination and rule, drawing on workshop input and may follow up with stakeholders for more information where relevant.