

## THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE PROCUREMENT  
OF STANDARD SERVICE OFFER  
GENERATION AS PART OF THE FOURTH  
ELECTRIC SECURITY PLAN FOR  
CUSTOMERS OF OHIO EDISON  
COMPANY, THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC  
ILLUMINATING COMPANY, AND THE  
TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY.

CASE NO. 16-776-EL-UNC

IN THE MATTER OF THE PROCUREMENT  
OF STANDARD SERVICE OFFER  
GENERATION FOR CUSTOMERS OF  
DAYTON POWER & LIGHT COMPANY.

CASE NO. 17-957-EL-UNC

IN THE MATTER OF THE PROCUREMENT  
OF STANDARD SERVICE OFFER  
GENERATION FOR CUSTOMERS OF OHIO  
POWER COMPANY.

CASE NO. 17-2391-EL-UNC

IN THE MATTER OF THE PROCUREMENT  
OF STANDARD SERVICE OFFER  
GENERATION FOR CUSTOMERS OF DUKE  
ENERGY OHIO, INC.

CASE NO. 18-6000-EL-UNC

### ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on January 3, 2023

{¶ 1} Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company (collectively, FirstEnergy); the Dayton Power and Light Company d/b/a AES Ohio (AES Ohio); Ohio Power Company d/b/a/ AEP Ohio (AEP Ohio); and Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke) each qualify as an electric utility as defined by R.C. 4928.01(A)(11) and as an electric distribution utility (EDU) as defined by R.C. 4928.01(A)(6).

{¶ 2} R.C. 4928.141 provides that electric utilities shall provide consumers a standard service offer (SSO) of all competitive retail electric services in accordance with R.C. 4928.142 or 4928.143. The SSO functions to make generation supply available to customers

that are not receiving this supply from a competitive retail electric services (CRES) provider and is sometimes referred to as default supply. The Commission has approved the above EDUs' electric security plans, each of which implemented a competitive auction-based SSO format, as well as a competitive bid procurement process for the EDUs' auctions, to procure generation supply for customers of each EDU for a certain period of time. *In re Ohio Edison Co., The Cleveland Elec. Illuminating Co., and The Toledo Edison Co.*, Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO, Opinion and Order (Mar. 31, 2016); *In re Dayton Power & Light Co.*, Case No. 16-395-EL-SSO, Opinion and Order (Oct. 20, 2017); *In re The Dayton Power and Light Co.*, Case No. 08-1094-EL-SSO, et al., Proposed Revised Tariffs (Nov. 26, 2019) *In re Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 16-1852-EL-SSO, et al., Opinion and Order (Apr. 25, 2018); and *In re Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.*, Case. No. 17-1263-EL-SSO, et al., Opinion and Order (Dec. 19, 2018). The use of this competitive bidding process is conducive to Ohio's legal framework that is designed to ensure that all retail electric customers served by EDUs have reliable access to electric generation supply at market-based prices.

{¶ 3} Over the past year, SSO prices resulting from the EDUs' SSO procurement auctions have significantly increased. *In re the Procurement of Std. Serv. Offer Generation as Part of the Fourth Elec. Sec. Plan for Customers of FirstEnergy*, Case No. 16-776-EL-UNC, Finding and Orders (Mar. 9, 2022), (Oct. 5, 2022); *In re the Procurement of Std. Serv. Offer Generation for Customers of AES Ohio*, Case No. 17-957-EL-UNC, Finding and Orders (Mar. 23, 2022), (Apr. 20, 2022), (Nov. 30, 2022); *In re the Procurement of Std. Serv. Offer Generation for the Customers of Ohio Power Company*, Case No. 17-2391-EL-UNC, Finding and Orders (Mar. 9, 2022), (Nov. 2, 2022); *In re the Procurement of Std. Serv. Offer Generation for Customers of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.*, Case No. 18-6000-EL-UNC, Finding and Orders (Feb. 23, 2022), (Sept. 21, 2022).

{¶ 4} Under the above circumstances, the Commission is investigating whether directing the EDUs to implement certain SSO auction modifications would help significantly reduce prices resulting from SSO auctions. The modifications include requiring EDUs to implement the following:

- a. Include six-month products in the mix of products for each auction; and
- b. Revise credit requirements for companies seeking to bid at the auctions in order to promote participation without unduly increasing risk.

{¶ 5} The Commissions seeks stakeholder input regarding the effectiveness of the proposed modifications; therefore, the attorney examiner invites stakeholders to file public comments discussing the proposal. Initial comments should be filed on or before January 24, 2023. Reply comments should be filed by February 3, 2023. Stakeholders who file comments should file a copy of the comments in each of the above-captioned case dockets.

{¶ 6} It is, therefore,

{¶ 7} ORDERED, That this case be opened to solicit public comment from interested stakeholders in accordance with Paragraph 4. It is, further,

{¶ 8} ORDERED, That initial comments be filed on or before January 24, 2023, and that reply comments be filed on or before February 3, 2023. A copy of the comments should be filed in each of the above-captioned case dockets.

{¶ 9} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties of record to the above-captioned cases.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

/s/Matthew J. Sandor

By: Matthew J. Sandor  
Attorney Examiner

MJS/dmh

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities  
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**1/3/2023 12:09:56 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 16-0776-EL-UNC, 17-0957-EL-UNC, 17-2391-EL-UNC, 18-6000-EL-UNC**

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry ordering that this case be open to solicit public comment from interested stakeholders in accordance with Paragraph 4 and that initial comments be filed on or before January 24, 2023, and that reply comments be filed on or before February 3, 2023. A copy of the comments should be filed in each of the above-captioned case dockets electronically filed by Ms. Donielle M. Hunter on behalf of Matthew J. Sandor, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio