# Network Access Policy

## Key performance indicators 2024/25

**March 2026**

Electricity Transmission

nationalgrid

# Contents

# Introduction

The GB Network Access Policy is designed to facilitate collaboration between the National Energy System Operator (NESO) and the Transmission Owners in Great Britain to deliver value for consumers in relation to the planning, management and operation of the electricity transmission systems in England, Wales and Scotland.

As part of these policy commitments and to ensure fully transparent outage planning processes, National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) produces a series of annual Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to monitor outage planning performance and outage delivery.

The KPIs are set in appendix A of the GB Network Access Policy which can be found here on our website.

The data below reflects the plan performance for 2024/25, for any queries please contact us.

The data trends for the 4 years of the RIIO-2 period need to be fully analysed to understand what actions NGET needs to take to ensure we can improve on downward trending KPIs. Further work is being done on this as part of our review of planning processes and this will ensure we can enable better plan stability in the future.

# Tables

These KPI results provide a concise view of our planning and delivery performance in T2Y4. The metrics highlight areas of stability, improvement and those where further work is underway. The insights presented here are helping to shape our ongoing planning transformation, which is expected to support improved performance as we move into the RIIO-T3 period.

### Key Performance Indicators

| Description | | | FY22 | FY23 | FY24 | FY25 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Long term outage planning performance:<br>Measure of the number of outages in the year ahead plan submitted at week 49 vs the number of actual outages delivered in the regulatory year.<br>This is a high-level measure of long-term Outage planning performance. | 1a | Number of outages in the year ahead plan | 1914 | 2155 | 1810 | 2055 | Includes 1861 ‘out-of-service' and 194 'in-service' outage bookings |
| | 1b | Number of YA outages delivered | 1164 | 1085 | 838 | 1037 | Includes 960 'out-of-service' and 77 'in-service' outage bookings |
| | 1c | Percentage of YA plan delivered | 61% | 50% | 46% | 50% | |
| 2. Accuracy of Year Ahead Outage Plan:<br>This is a measure of the TOs capability to construct and deliver a robust outage plan. This is a detailed measure of Long-Term Outage Planning Performance | 2a | Percentage of outages in the year ahead plan started on the date agreed at the year ahead stage - week 49 | 32% | 26% | 25% | 28% | Includes 'out-of-service' and 'in-service' outage bookings. |
| | 2b | Percentage of outages in YA plan started on agreed week at YA stage | 39% | 31% | 30% | 35% | |
| | 2c | Percentage of outages in YA plan changed for a positive reason | 10% | 7% | 5% | 6% | Includes outage bundling, request to accelerate works, early completion of works, and User or NESO requests to change an outage |
| | 3a | No. of new within year Outages submitted to | - | - | 470 | 711 | |

| Description | | | FY22 | FY23 | FY24 | FY25 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Within Year Outage Planning Performance:<br>Measure of new outages requested within year by the TO during the relevant regulatory year. These are essential outages to carry out | | NESO prior to Optimisation Phase | | | | | |
| | 3b | No. of new within year Outages submitted to NESO during Optimisation Phase | - | - | 928 | 1253 | |
| | 3c | No. of new within year Outages submitted to NESO during Delivery Phase | - | - | 1438 | 2184 | |
| 4.How many connection assets or transmission circuits are out of service more than once per annum? | | Measure of the number of times the same item of equipment or circuit is removed from service | 1157 | 1181 | 1480[1] | 640 | |
| 5. Outage coordination:<br>Measure of number of times the TO has carried out different work during a single outage. Measure is based on the number of outages that have been combined into a single outage vs the total number of outages delivered in a regulatory year | | | - | - | - | - | NGET outages have work bundled via the optimisation process during year-ahead plan build which includes construction and maintenance work. Due to the nature in which NGET records information in the Outage management tool (ENAMS) it cannot be reported in a volumetric way |
| 6. Percentage of TO Outages Started Within 60 minutes of Agreed Start Time | | Measure of outage start time accuracy will be the agreed Planned Start Time | 53% | 44% | 45% | 43% | Includes in service bookings |

[1] Figure updated after re-validation of last year's reported value (2846) following discovery of discrepancy in how we reported this, as part of our continuous improvement process.

| Description | | | FY22 | FY23 | FY24 | FY25 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | compared to Actual Start Time | | | | | |
| 7. Transmission Connected Generation Percentage of Annual Access Curtailed by Bilateral Connection Agreement Per Annum - Firm Connections | | Measure of lost network access due to transmission outages and connection agreements. Measure would be 100 x (total days of actual outages \ 365). | - | 0% | 0% | 0% | We only have a small selection of site on the NGET network where this would apply. Only a single day outage restricting output to zero. |
| 8. Transmission Connected Generation Percentage of Annual Access Curtailed by Bilateral Connection Agreement Per Annum – Non-Firm Connections | | Measure of lost network access due to transmission outages and connection agreements. Measure would be 100 x (total days of actual outages \ 365) | - | 0% | 3.62% | 0.09% | |
| 9. Average Outage Duration Accuracy Measure of TO ability to plan outage durations. A negative figure would indicate outages generally overrun, a positive figure would indicate outages generally finish early | 9a | In plan before week 49: % finished early | 22% | 18% | 17% | 20% | These are only 'out-of-service' outage bookings |
| | | In plan before week 49: % finished on time | 45% | 44% | 44% | 44% | |
| | | In plan before week 49: % finished late | 33% | 39% | 39% | 35% | |
| | 9b | In plan after week 49: % finished early | 11% | 16% | 13% | 14% | |
| | | In plan after week 49: % finished on time | 80% | 80% | 83% | 82% | |
| | | In plan after week 49: % finished late | 8% | 4% | 4% | 4% | |

| Description | | | FY22 | FY23 | FY24 | FY25 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. Number of Unplanned Outages due to Faults or Defects This is a measure of the number of times an asset or circuit has been removed from service due to a system fault, has been removed from service by emergency | 10a | Number of system faults removing an asset or circuit from service | - | 260 | 64 | 81 | |
| | 10b | Number of emergency switching outages removing an asset or circuit from service | - | 1 | 7 | 8 | |
| | 10c | All other unplanned outages when an asset or circuit has been made unavailable to NESO due to a defect | - | 173 | 350 | 398 | |
| 11. Enhanced Service Provision Measure of the number of STCP11.4 proposals identified within a regulatory year. | 11a | Number of proposals identified by NESO or TO | | 42 | 55 | 56 | A total of 56 Enhanced Services were identified and submitted by either NGET or NESO |
| | 11b | Number of proposals delivered by the TO | | 34 | 25 | 36 | 36 of the 56 proposals were confirmed as both deliverable and providing consumer benefits and were thus completed within the 2024/25 plan year. |
| | 11c | Measure of System Operational costs savings vs cost to deliver by TO | | £176.7m | £93.9m Forecast<br>£51.17m Outturn | £53.70m - Forecast<br>£64.33m - Outturn | Across the year, the 36 Enhanced Services delivered had Estimated Constraint Savings (Ex-Ante) of £53.70m and Actual Constraint Savings (Ex-Post) of £64.33m with cost of solutions forecast/actual of £0.32m/£0.29m. |

| Description | | FY22 | FY23 | FY24 | FY25 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. In Service Works | Measure of the number of “In Service” bookings to highlight works taking place without an asset being taken out of service e.g. Telecoms works, Risk of Trips etc | 953 | 508 | 448 | 570 | Includes OHL delayed auto-reclose (DAR) outages, circuit risk of trips, telecoms outages, and equipment/circuit testing outages. |

# Further narrative on T2Y4 Network Access Policy KPIs

Following the completion of Year 4 of the RIIO-T2 period (T2Y4), we have published our outage KPIs. This additional narrative explains some of the trends. There are areas where further improvement is needed, and we have called these out with specific actions that are being taken. In particular, we are undertaking planning and delivery transformation programmes and we believe this work will provide solutions to the underlying issues that are impacting these KPIs. Our transformation plans will carry on into RIIO-T3.

1. **Long Term Outage Planning Performance**

   The Year Ahead (YA) plan size has varied over the past four years, but our delivery performance improved in FY25. After declining from FY22 through to FY24, delivery rose to 50% of the YA plan in FY25, up from 46% the year before. This highlights ongoing progress in optimising outage delivery despite increase in plan volume.

2. **Accuracy of the Year Ahead Outage Plan**

   In FY25, the accuracy of the Year Ahead (YA) plan improved: 28% of outages started on the agreed date and 35% started in the agreed week, up 3 and 5 percentage points respectively versus FY24, reversing the prior decline. Adherence to the YA plan strengthened in FY25, particularly weekly start performance.

   The share of changes made for positive reasons also edged up on FY24, giving greater confidence in planning accuracy and optimisation.

3. **Within Year Outage Planning Performance**

   In FY25, within-year outage requests increased across all phases compared with FY24: prior to the Optimisation Phase they were about 51% higher, during the Optimisation Phase they rose by about 35%, and during the Delivery Phase they were about 52% higher.

   Plan changes continue to occur, including those arising from unforeseeable factors, which drives a higher number of new outage requests during the Delivery Phase than during the Optimisation Phase. These changes are often directly related to unforeseen factors such as network security, asset faults, and external drivers such as customer requests. The ability to respond to plan changes and re-optimise is essential to maintain effective delivery of planned works however while some in-year outage changes remain essential, enhancements to plan build and coordination through planning transformation will ensure more outage requirements are identified in the Year Ahead plan, reducing those emerging within year.

   Changes to the outage plan made prior to and during the optimisation phase are considered positive when compared to short term changes in the delivery phase, as changes at this earlier stage allows collaboration with NESO to optimise and bundle, improving overall efficiency.

4. **How Many Connection Assets or Transmission Circuits Are Out of Service More Than Once Per Annum?**

   We recorded fewer repeat removals, with only 640 assets taken out of service more than once in the year, which is just over half of FY22 and FY23 levels and under half of FY24. These assets being taken out of service more than once per year is driven by a combination of planned and unplanned outages.

5. **Outage Coordination**

   NGET outages have work bundled via the optimisation process during the Year-Ahead plan build and this includes construction and maintenance work. Due to the way in which information is recorded in ENAMS, it cannot be easily reported in a volumetric way. 91% of our outages have had more than one piece of work planned which demonstrates a high level of work bundling.

6. **Percentage of TO Outages Started Within 60mins of Agreed Start Time**

   There is a drop to 43% from 45% of last year, but this figure is still affected by complexities we have coordinating outage releases across multiple stakeholders. This includes external parties and factors which mean that some outage releases need to wait until later in the day for more suitable conditions. These complexities of stakeholder coordination have existed in each of the four years of T2.

7. **Transmission Connected Generation - Percentage of Annual Access Curtailed by Bilateral Connection Agreement Per Annum - Firm Connections**

   None.

8. **Transmission Connected Generation - Percentage of Annual Access Curtailed by Bilateral Connection Agreement Per Annum – Non-Firm Connections**

   This measure applies to only a very limited number of sites on the NGET network. During the reporting period, only one applicable outage occurred at Kemsley substation whereby a busbar outage requested by the Distribution Network Operator isolated a Super Grid Transformer from the network, this outage lasted 8.17 hours.

9. **Average Outage Duration Accuracy**

   Across these measures, performance remains broadly steady, with some modest movements in individual categories. For outages planned before week 49, around 44–45% were delivered on time, with late completions easing from 39% to 35% and early completions staying within 17–22%. Outages added later in the year continued to show stronger accuracy, with 80–83% completed on time and only 4–8% finishing late. We are continuing to strengthen earlier-stage planning to improve long term planning accuracy via our planning transformation work to focus on better outage preparation and improve accuracy.

## 10. Number of Unplanned Outages Due to Faults or Defects

Eight emergency switching actions were undertaken to promptly address equipment condition issues and maintain network safety and reliability.

System faults resulting in the removal of an asset or circuit from service increased from 64 in FY24 to 81 in FY25, reflecting a modest year-on-year rise in fault-driven unavailability. Unplanned outages due to defects also increased, from 350 in FY24 to 398 in FY25.

## 11. Enhanced Service Provision

We delivered more enhanced services to NESO compared to FY24. The proportional increase in delivery was due to increased feasibility of delivering solutions.

## 12. In Service Works

The number of In-Service bookings has increased compared to FY24 and FY23. This trend is driven by an increase in specific work types such as protection, control and cyber interventions.

# Contact us

If you have any questions, please do contact us.

National Grid plc
National Grid House,
Warwick Technology Park,
Gallows Hill, Warwick.
CV34 6DA United Kingdom
Registered in England and Wales
No. 4031152

**nationalgrid.com**

nationalgrid