

DELIVERED VIA EMAIL

CRA No. D19518-00

December 21, 2016

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 November 30, 2016 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 November 29, 2016 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 9 of the Finding and Order cited above, the attached redacted letter is no different than the letter sent to you on November 29, 2016.

Sincerely yours,

CRA INTERNATIONAL, INC.



Robert Lee
Vice President

cc:

Jason Rafeld, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Tammy Turkenton, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Ray Strom, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Attachment



DELIVERED BY EMAIL

CRA No. D19518

November 29, 2016

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, November 29, 2016 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 for each contract in the auction.
- 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
November 29, 2016
Page 2

Sincerely yours,

CRA INTERNATIONAL, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robert J. Lee', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Robert J. Lee
Vice President

cc:

Asim Z. Haque, Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
M. Howard Petricoff, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Lynn Slaby, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
M. Beth Trombold, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Thomas W. Johnson, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Jason Rafeld, Chief of Staff, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Ray Strom, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Tamara Turkenton, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Tim Benedict, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Greg Price, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Angela Hawkins, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Ryan Gentil, Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
Frank Mossburg, Bates White, LLC



Amy Spiller
 November 29, 2016
 Page 3

Table 1. Summary of SSO Auction Results

Period of Delivery	June 1, 2017 - May 31, 2018
Number of Registered Bidders	12
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	76
Number of tranches bid in round 1 divided by tranche target	4.47
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	14
Was there a sealed-bid round?	No
Number of winning bidders	4
Starting price range	\$80.00 to \$100.00 per MWh
Starting price	
Tranche-weighted average price of winning bids	\$50.20



Amy Spiller
 November 29, 2016
 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.	3	\$50.20
American Electric Power Service Corporation	4	\$50.20
Direct Energy Business Marketing, LLC	5	\$50.20
Exelon Generation Company, LLC	5	\$50.20
TOTAL	17	\$50.20



Amy Spiller
 November 29, 2016
 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
 November 29, 2016
 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

12/21/2016 1:29:33 PM

in

Case No(s). 15-6000-EL-UNC

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