Chantale LaCasse Senior Vice President

National Economic Research Associates, Inc. 1255 23rd Street NW, Suite 600 Washington, DC 20037 Office: 202-466-9218, Fax: 202-466-3605 Mobile: +1 919 699 1230 Chantale.LaCasse@nera.com www.nera.com

DELIVERED BY EMAIL

March 29, 2016

Ray Strom Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Rates & Analysis Department Siting, Efficiency & Renewables Division

Tamara S. Turkenton Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Rates & Analysis Department Regulatory Services Division

Re: Notification of Auction Results under AEP Ohio's CBP

Dear Mr. Strom and Ms. Turkenton:

Please find attached to this letter the redacted version of the report that NERA Economic Consulting, as Auction Manager under AEP Ohio's Competitive Bidding Process ("CBP"), prepared at the conclusion of the March 2016 Auction under ESP III. This auction procured full requirements supply for 17% of the energy and capacity requirements of AEP Ohio's Standard Service Offer ("SSO") customers for a supply period of twenty-four months.

Please let us know whether you require any additional information.

Sincerely yours,

Contate Ca (Gore.

Chantale LaCasse, Senior Vice President, NERA

cc: Andre Porter, Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas Johnson, Commissioner,, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Lynn Slaby, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio M. Beth Trombold, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio



Page 2

Asim Z. Haque, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Jason Rafeld, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Greg Price, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Frank Mossburg, Boston Pacific Company

Michael McCulty, AEP Ohio David Weiss, AEP Ohio Steven T. Nourse, AEP Ohio

Final Report of the Auction Manager AEP Ohio CBP

March 29, 2016

(Redacted Version)



Table 1. Summary of Auction Results

| | Delivery Period |
|---|---------------------------------|
| | June 1, 2016 to May 31, 2018 |
| Number of Registered Bidders | 15 |
| Total initial eligibility of Registered Bidders (# of tranches) | |
| Total initial eligibility divided by tranche target | |
| Number of bidders that submitted bids in round 1 | |
| Number of tranches bid in round 1 | |
| Number of tranches bid in round 1 divided by tranche target | |
| Number of tranches to procure in auction (tranche target) | 17 |
| Number of tranches procured in auction | 17 |
| Number of rounds in the auction | 14 |
| Number of winning bidders | 5 |
| Starting price range (\$/MWh) | 70.00 - 90.00 |
| Starting price (\$/MWh) | |
| Clearing price (\$/MWh) | 46.24 |

| | Delivery Period June 1, 2016 to May 31, 2018 |
|-------------------------|--|
| Clearing Price (\$/MWh) | 46.24 |
| Winning Bidder | Tranches Won |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Track | |
| Total | 17 |

| # | Question | Answer |
|---|--|--------|
| 1 | Were the competitive bidding rules violated? | |
| 2 | Does the Auction Manager believe the auction was open, fair, transparent, and competitive? | |
| 3 | Did bidders have sufficient information to prepare for the auction? | |
| 4 | Was the information generally provided to bidders in accordance with the published timetable? Was the timetable updated appropriately as needed? | |
| 5 | Were there any issues and questions left unresolved prior to the auction that created material uncertainty for bidders? | |
| 6 | Were there any procedural problems or errors with the auction, including the electronic bidding process, the backup bidding process, and communications between bidders and the Auction Manager? | |
| 7 | Were protocols for communication between bidders and the Auction Manager adhered to? | |

| # | Question | Answer |
|----|--|--------|
| 8 | Were there any hardware or software problems or errors, either with the auction system or with its associated communications systems? | |
| 9 | Were there any unanticipated delays during the auction? | |
| 10 | Did unanticipated delays appear to adversely affect bidding in the auction? | |
| 11 | Were appropriate data backup procedures planned and carried out? | |
| 12 | Were any security breaches observed with the auction process? | |
| 13 | Were protocols for communications followed by AEP Ohio, the Auction Manager, the PUCO, and the PUCO's consultant during the auction? | |
| 14 | Were the protocols followed for decisions regarding changes in auction parameters (e.g., volume adjustments and price decrements)? | |
| 15 | Were the calculations (e.g., for price decrements or bidder eligibility) produced by the auction software double-checked or reproduced off-line by the Auction Manager? | |

| # | Question | Answer |
|----|---|--------|
| 16 | Was there evidence of confusion or misunderstanding on the part of bidders that delayed or impaired the auction? | |
| 17 | Were the communications between the Auction Manager and bidders timely and effective? | |
| 18 | Was there evidence that bidders felt unduly rushed during the process? | |
| 19 | Was there any evidence of collusion or improper coordination among bidders? | |
| 20 | Was there any evidence of anti- competitive behavior in the auction? | |
| 21 | Was information made public appropriately? Was confidential and sensitive information treated appropriately? | |
| 22 | Were there factors exogenous to the auction (e.g., changes in market environment) that materially affected the auction in unanticipated ways? | |

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

3/30/2016 3:15:33 PM

in

Case No(s). 15-0792-EL-UNC

Summary: Report - Redacted Version - Final Report of the Auction Manager, AEP Ohio CBP, March 29, 2016 electronically filed by Raymond W. Strom on behalf of PUCO Staff