



DELIVERED BY EMAIL

CRA No. D17783

October 28, 2013

Ms. Dona Seger-Lawson
Director Regulatory Operations
The Dayton Power and Light Company
1065 Woodman Drive
Dayton, OH

Re: Notification of CBP Auction Results

Dear Ms. Seger-Lawson:

This is to inform you that we have confirmed the results of the Dayton Power and Light Company's ("DP&L") Competitive Bidding Process Auction ("Auction") to procure supply for Standard Service Offer (SSO) customers of DP&L. The Auction began on Monday, October 28, 2013 and concluded the same day.

There are three tables attached to this letter.

- Table 1 summarizes the results of the Auction.
- Table 2 shows, for each winning bidder, the number of tranches won and the tranche-weighted average price to be paid.
- Table 3 provides the Auction Manager's assessment of the conduct of the auction.

In accordance with the Bidding Rules, winning bidders will be contacted directly by DP&L to execute the Master SSO Supply Agreement no later than three (3) business days following the close of the auction.



Dona Seger-Lawson
October 28, 2013
Page 2

Sincerely yours,

CRA INTERNATIONAL, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert J. Lee", written in a cursive style.

Robert J. Lee
Vice President

cc:

Todd A. Snitchler, Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Asim Z. Haque, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Steven D. Lesser, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Lynn Slaby, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Beth Trombold, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Eric Weldele, Chief of Staff, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Ray Strom, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Tim Benedict, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Frank Mossburg, Boston Pacific Company
Eric Brown, The Dayton Power and Light Company
Randall Griffin, The Dayton Power and Light Company
Chuck Hofmann, The Dayton Power and Light Company
Nathan Parke, The Dayton Power and Light Company

Dona Seger-Lawson
 October 28, 2013
 Page 3

Table 1. Summary of SSO Auction Results

Period of Delivery	January 1, 2014 - May 31, 2017
Number of Registered Bidders	10
Total initial eligibility of Registered Bidders	
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)	10 tranches
Number of tranches procured in auction	10 tranches
Number of rounds in clock phase	24
Was there a sealed-bid round?	No
Number of winning bidders	3
Starting price range	\$80.00 to \$105.00 per MWh
Starting price	
Tranche-weighted average price of winning bids	\$49.32 per MWh

Dona Seger-Lawson
 October 28, 2013
 Page 4

Table 2. Winning Bidders and Tranches Won

Winning Bidder	Number of Winning Tranches	Tranche-Weighted Average Price to be Paid (\$/MWh)
TOTAL	10	\$49.32

Dona Seger-Lawson
 October 28, 2013
 Page 5

Table 3. Auction Manager's Assessment of the Conduct of the Auction

	Question	
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 back-up bidding process, and communications between bidders and the Auction Manager?	
7	Were protocols for communication between bidders and the Auction Manager adhered to?	
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 back-up procedures planned and carried out?	

Dona Seger-Lawson
 October 28, 2013
 Page 6

	Question	
12	Were any security breaches observed with the auction process?	
13	Were protocols followed for communications among The Dayton Power and Light Company, 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?	
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

10/30/2013 10:46:22 AM

in

Case No(s). 13-2120-EL-UNC

Summary: Report - Notification of CBP Auction Results - Redacted Version electronically filed
by Raymond W. Strom on behalf of PUCO Staff