

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20580

Division of Advertising Practices

Mary K. Engle Associate Director

November 30, 2011

Ms. Lydia B. Parnes Mr. Nathan Ferguson Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, PC 1700 K Street, NW 5th Floor Washington, DC 20006

## Re: Blue Buffalo Company, Ltd., FTC File No. 102-3144

Dear Ms. Parnes and Mr. Ferguson:

The staff of the Federal Trade Commission's Division of Advertising Practices has conducted an investigation into whether representations made by your client, Blue Buffalo Company, Ltd. ("Blue Buffalo"), regarding its pet foods violated Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, following a referral from the National Advertising Division of the Council of Better Business Bureaus ("NAD"). Blue Buffalo participated in the NAD's self-regulatory process and appealed one of the NAD's adverse findings to the National Advertising Review Board of the Council of Better Business Bureaus ("NARB"), which agreed with the NAD decision.

The FTC staff reviewed claims brought to its attention by the NAD and some additional claims. The review included Blue Buffalo's claims that its pet foods contained "no animal by-products," contained human-grade ingredients, helped protect pets from age-related diseases, and contained ingredients that had been proven to provide a number of significant health benefits for pets. Additionally, the staff reviewed, at the NAD's request, Blue Buffalo's continuing claims that its pet food ingredients provided superior anti-oxidant protection, after Blue Buffalo promised to stop doing so.

Upon review of the matter, we have determined not to recommend enforcement action at this time. Among the factors we considered are Blue Buffalo's substantial website changes, which included the removal of age-related disease claims, establishment claims, and humangrade ingredients claims; and Blue Buffalo's removal of "no animal by-products" claims from its website and packaging. This action is not to be construed as a determination that a violation Ms. Lydia B. Parnes Mr. Nathan Ferguson November 30, 2011 Page 2

did not occur, just as the pendency of an investigation should not be construed as a determination that a violation has occurred. The Commission reserves the right to take such further action as the public interest may warrant.

Very truly yours, Mary K, Engle Mary K. Engle

Associate Director

cc: Andrea C. Levine, National Advertising Division