



DELIVERED VIA EMAIL

CRA No. D16035-00

June 12, 2013

Amy Spiller
Deputy General Counsel
Duke Energy Business Services
139 E. Fourth Street, 1303-Main
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Re: Notification of CBP Auction Results

Dear Ms. Spiller:

Pursuant to the requirements of paragraph 10 of the May 22, 2013 Finding and Order of the Public Utility Commission of Ohio ("PUCO" or "Commission"), please find attached a redacted version of the post-auction letter addressed to you (and cc'd to others) that the Auction Manager, CRA International, submitted on May 21, 2013 following the conclusion of the Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. ("DEO") Competitive Bidding Process Auction to procure supply for Standard Service Offer customers of DEO.

Other than an update to the redactions pursuant to paragraph 10 of the Finding and Order cited above, the attached redacted letter is no different than the letter sent to you on May 21, 2013.

Sincerely yours,

CRA INTERNATIONAL, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert Lee", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Robert Lee
Principal

cc:

Eric Weldele, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Tim Benedict, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Ray Strom, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Attachment



DELIVERED BY EMAIL

CRA No. D16035

May 21, 2013

Amy Spiller
Deputy General Counsel
Duke Energy Business Services
139 E. Fourth Street, 1303-Main
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Re: Notification of CBP Auction Results

Dear Ms. Spiller:

This is to inform you that we have confirmed the results of the Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.'s Competitive Bidding Process Auction ("Auction") to procure supply for Standard Service Offer (SSO) customers of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. The Auction began on Tuesday, May 21, 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 Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. to execute the Master SSO Supply Agreement no later than three (3) business days following the close of the auction.



Amy Spiller
May 21, 2013
Page 2

Sincerely yours,

CRA INTERNATIONAL, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert J. Lee", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Robert J. Lee
Principal

cc:

Todd A. Snitchler, Chairman, 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
Jim Northrup, Duke Energy Corporation

Amy Spiller
May 21, 2013
Page 3

Table 1. Summary of SSO Auction Results

Period of Delivery	June 1, 2014 - May 31, 2015
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	97
Number of tranches bid in round 1 divided by tranche target	5.71
Number of tranches to procure in auction (tranche target)	17 tranches
Number of tranches procured in auction	17 tranches
Number of rounds in clock phase	15
Was there a sealed-bid round?	Yes
Number of winning bidders	4
Starting price range	\$65.00-\$85.00 per MWh
Starting price	
Tranche-weighted average price of winning bids	\$54.16 per MWh

Amy Spiller
May 21, 2013
Page 4

Table 2. Winning Bidders and Tranches Won

Winning Bidder	Number of Winning Tranches	Tranche-Weighted Average Price to be Paid (\$/MWh)
AEP Energy Partners, Inc.	2	\$54.19
ENCOA	2	\$54.17
Exelon Generation Company	8	\$54.17
FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.	5	\$54.14
TOTAL	17	\$54.16

Amy Spiller
May 21, 2013
Page 5

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

	Question	
1	Were the competitive bidding rules violated?	No
2	Does the Auction Manager believe the auction was open, fair, transparent, and competitive?	Yes
3	Did bidders have sufficient information to prepare for the auction?	Yes. Bidders received information from the competitive bidding process documents, the Information Website, questions-and-answers posted to the Information Website, and bidder information sessions.
4	Was the information generally provided to bidders in accordance with the published timetable? Was the timetable updated appropriately as needed?	Yes
5	Were there any issues and questions left unresolved prior to the auction that created material uncertainty for bidders?	We do not believe that there were any unresolved issues or questions 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?	No
7	Were protocols for communication between bidders and the Auction Manager adhered to?	Yes
8	Were there any hardware or software problems or errors, either with the auction system or with its associated communications systems?	No
9	Were there any unanticipated delays during the auction?	No
10	Did unanticipated delays appear to adversely affect bidding in the auction?	No
11	Were appropriate data back-up procedures planned and carried out?	Yes

Amy Spiller
May 21, 2013
Page 6

	Question	
12	Were any security breaches observed with the auction process?	No
13	Were protocols followed for communications among Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., the Auction Manager, the PUCO, and the PUCO's consultant during the auction?	Yes
14	Were the protocols followed for decisions regarding changes in auction parameters (e.g., volume adjustments and price decrements)?	Yes
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?	Yes
16	Was there evidence of confusion or misunderstanding on the part of bidders that delayed or impaired the auction?	No
17	Were the communications between the Auction Manager and bidders timely and effective?	Yes
18	Was there evidence that bidders felt unduly rushed during the process?	No
19	Was there any evidence of collusion or improper coordination among bidders?	No
20	Was there any evidence of anti-competitive behavior in the auction?	No
21	Was information made public appropriately? Was confidential and sensitive information treated appropriately?	Yes
22	Were there factors exogenous to the auction (e.g., changes in market environment) that materially affected the auction in unanticipated ways?	No, not that we are aware of.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

6/12/2013 12:31:46 PM

in

Case No(s). 11-6000-EL-UNC

Summary: Report of Auction Manager - Notification of CBP Auction Results - Updated
Redacted Version electronically filed by Mr. Robert Wolfe on behalf of PUCO Staff