postmetry

D

What's inside the newsletter from

# Des Petits Hauts

| | |
|---|---|
| Sender | eshop@despetitshauts.com |
| Sending platform | Shopify Messaging |
| Sector | Fashion & retail |
| Emails read | 16 campaigns, 1 transactional |
| Period | October 2026 |

Our address was subscribed in August 2026, after the CNIL recommendation was published (April 14, 2026).

Overall score

A B C **D 64/100** E F

The main finding

## An open-tracking pixel is present on 1 transactional message.

It is the first of 8 points to fix. The highest score is deliverability (79/100), the lowest compliance (48/100), better than 75% of the 643 brands measured.

**Transactional**
1 message

October 2026 · calculated on 23 November

### Compliance

**48** /100

better than 75% of the 643 brands measured

### Deliverability

**79** /100

better than 7% of the 642 brands measured

### Technical

**65** /100

better than 8% of the 643 brands measured

### Experience

**70** /100

better than 72% of the 643 brands measured

## 8 points to fix

Each line leads to the criterion in its family, with the excerpt that establishes it and how to fix it.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Priority | **An open-tracking pixel is present**<br>Criterion “No open-tracking pixel” · Compliance · on 1 transactional message<br>`<img src="https://despetitshauts.com/_t/open/***?en=***`<br>Open tracking is turned off in the tracking settings, at the campaign or account level. | −35 pts<br>out of 35 in Compliance |
| Priority | **Layout tables nested beyond the threshold**<br>Criterion “A shallow template” · Technical · measured on 1 transactional message<br>Flatten the template: one content block per table, placed directly in the main column, with no wrapper table around each section. | −20 pts<br>out of 20 in Technical |
| To review | **The message puts obstacles in the way of assistive technology**<br>Criterion “The message stays readable with assistive technology” · Experience · measured on 1 transactional message<br>Four fixes, all in the template: declare the message language on the <html> tag (lang="en" for an email in English), describe each content image in its alt attribute, mark layout tables with role="presentation", and write links that say where they lead rather than “click here”. | −15 pts<br>out of 20 in Experience |
| To review | **The published DMARC policy keeps out no impersonation**<br>Criterion “DMARC policy that helps keep out some impersonation” · Deliverability · on 1 transactional message | −15 pts<br>out of 15 in Deliverability |
| To review | **No plain-text version accompanies the message**<br>Criterion “The message can be rendered outside HTML” · Experience · measured on 1 transactional message | −15 pts<br>out of 15 in Experience |
| To review | **Some links lead nowhere**<br>Criterion “Every link leads somewhere” · Technical · on 1 transactional message | −10 pts<br>out of 10 in Technical |
| To review | **No separate path to refuse tracking**<br>Criterion “The recipient keeps control over tracking” · Compliance · measured on 1 transactional message | −10 pts<br>out of 20 in Compliance |
| Secondary | **No link leads to the privacy policy**<br>Criterion “The message says who is writing and under which rules” · Compliance · measured on 1 transactional message | −6.7 pts<br>out of 20 in Compliance |

**14 criteria met**, including « An untracked path leads to the site » and « DKIM signature validated ».
They are listed in their family, below.

---

## Every send, at the time it arrived

One dot per message received by our subscription since October. Tap a dot to open it; the arrows move from one send to the next.

Technical reading of the send of Oct. 7, 2026 →

**16**

campaigns in 4 weeks

about 4 a week, from October to November

**No fixed day**

sending day

Wednesday leads, 4 of the 16 campaigns

**8 h**

favourite sending hour

50% of campaigns arrive between 8:00 and 9:00

**22 Nov.**

last send received

« Derniers Jours | Jusqu'à -40% sur nos Ventes Privées »




Campaign 16 of 16

Sunday 22 Nov., 8:11

### Derniers Jours | Jusqu'à -40% sur nos Ventes Privées

Type Marketing campaign

Score 64 / 100

Pixel Present, detected by the form of its address

Change observed on this send, to be confirmed by the next one.

### Sending day

Tap a bar to find its sends on the timeline.




### Arrival time

Hour by hour, on the 16 campaigns.



**1 change observed since October** — Each campaign is compared with the previous one, criterion by criterion.

22 Nov. The detail of this change, criterion by criterion, is reserved for the Pro version.
to be confirmed by the next send · the per-send score goes from 60 to 64

## Criteria in detail

The 24 criteria + 1 bonus

**14** met · **3** partly met · **5** not met · **0** not observable · **2** not applicable




### Compliance

These checks cover what the send imposes on the recipient and what it leaves them: measurement of their behaviour, ways to leave, tracking of their objection.

Tracking pixels: the CNIL rule · Method, Compliance family

better than 75% of the 643 brands measured

**The calculation** · 48 pts out of 100 — 2 met · 2 partly met · 1 not met · 1 not applicable




Weight of each criterion in the score.

#### No open-tracking pixel — Not met — 0/35 pts

Open-tracking pixel detected on the only transactional message concerned

0 points out of 35 — met on 0 of 1 transactional message concerned.

An invisible image tells the sending platform that the message was opened, when, and from which device: this is individual tracking of reading behavior, and the recipient sees none of it. The message does not say whether they consented or objected — that choice lives in the sending platform, not in the email.

Served from `despetitshauts.com`.

The excerpt that establishes it

```
<img src="https://despetitshauts.com/_t/open/***?en=***
```

**How to fix it**

Open tracking is turned off in the tracking settings, at the campaign or account level. Look for “open tracking”.

Turning it off loses the open rate — a measure already largely distorted by mailbox privacy protections, which preload images — and changes nothing about the click rate.

Met when no tracking pixel is present. A single pixel is enough for the criterion not to be met on an email.

CNIL 14/04/2026 · LIL art.82 · PM-PRIV-001 · The detection rule

Loi Informatique et Libertés, article 82 (https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/article_lc/LEGIARTI000037813978/)

CNIL, délibération n° 2026-042 du 12 mars 2026, publiée au JO le 14 avril 2026 — champ d'application (https://www.cnil.fr/sites/default/files/2026-04/recommandation-pixels_de_suivi.pdf)

CNIL, foire aux questions du 22 juillet 2026 (https://www.cnil.fr/fr/faq-recommandation-pixels-courriers-electroniques)
CNIL, délibération n° 2026-042 du 12 mars 2026, publiée au JO le 14 avril 2026 — retrait du consentement (https://www.cnil.fr/sites/default/files/2026-04/recommandation-pixels_de_suivi.pdf)

### Unsubscribing is possible and announced

Not applicable

not applicable

This measurement did not apply to any of the emails received. It **drops out of the denominator**: it is never counted as a failure.

Met when the message announces unsubscribing in its headers, through a page rather than an email to write, and in its body. The detail says which of the two is missing. Not applicable to a transactional email.

RFC 2369 · PM-PRIV-002

### The recipient keeps control over tracking

Partly met

10/20 pts

No separate path to refuse tracking on the only transactional message concerned (1 of 2 measures met)

10 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 1 transactional message.

**How to fix it**

A path separate from the unsubscribe link leads to a preference centre where the recipient can refuse tracking (opens, clicks) without unsubscribing. Most email platforms offer this page; otherwise it goes in the template footer, with its own link, named for what it does (“manage my preferences”, “refuse tracking”).

The page takes an afternoon to set up and then serves every send. It is what the CNIL recommendation expects from an email that measures how its readers behave.

Two measures: does the unsubscribe link go through a tracker, and does a separate path lead to a preference center or to refusing tracking? Neither establishes that a refusal succeeds — checking would require following the link, which would record a click on the sending platform's side. They describe the control left to the recipient, not the result they would get.

What was measured — 1 met out of 2

- Untracked unsubscribe link on a single transactional message — Met
- No separate path to refuse tracking on the only transactional message concerned — Not met

CNIL 14/04/2026·Postmetry · PM-PRIV-003

### The message says who is writing and under which rules

Partly met

13.3/20 pts

No link leads to the privacy policy on the only transactional message concerned (2 of 3 measures met)

13.3 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 1 transactional message.

**How to fix it**

The footer of the message names the sender (company name, postal address) and links to its privacy policy with a direct link to the website, not through a tracking domain. These details go once into the base template and then appear in every send.

Nothing to lose: these lines already exist on the website; they only need to be carried over.

A commercial email must make it possible to identify the advertiser (CPCE, article L. 34-5), and the recipient must be able to know who processes their data. This indicator groups what a message can show of it.

What was measured — 2 met out of 3

- The message names its sender on a single transactional message — Met
- A reply to the message is possible on a single transactional message — Met
- No link leads to the privacy policy on the only transactional message concerned — Not met

CPCE L.34-5 · directive 2000/31 art.6 · CAN-SPAM · PM-PRIV-004

### An untracked path leads to the site — Met

15 pts

An untracked path leads to the site on a single transactional message

15 points out of 15 — met on 1 of 1 transactional message concerned.

Met when at least one link in the message leads to the brand's site without going through a click counter.

Postmetry · PM-PRIV-005

### No recipient identifier in the message — Met

10 pts

No recipient identifier in the message on a single transactional message

10 points out of 10 — met on 1 of 1 transactional message concerned.

Met when the recipient's address appears — neither in clear, nor encoded, nor hashed — in no URL and no proprietary header. Addressing headers do not count: they carry it by design.

Postmetry · RGPD art.4 en repère · PM-PRIV-020

---




## Deliverability

These checks read the authentication verdict set by our server when the message arrived. This verdict is dated by construction: we never recalculate it, which would query today's DNS rather than the DNS of the day the email was sent.

Gmail sender requirements ↗ (https://support.google.com/a/answer/81126)
Yahoo requirements ↗ (https://senders.yahooinc.com/best-practices/) Method, Deliverability family

better than 7% of the 642 brands measured

**The calculation** · 55 pts out of 70, scaled to 100

4 met · 1 not met · 1 not applicable




Weight of each criterion in the score.

### DKIM signature validated — Met

20 pts

Valid DKIM signature on a single transactional message

20 points out of 20 — met on 1 of 1 transactional message concerned.

Met when our receiving server validated the DKIM signature of the email.

RFC 6376 · RFC 8601 · PM-DELIV-001
RFC 6376 — DomainKeys Identified Mail (DKIM) Signatures (https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6376)
RFC 8601 — Message Header Field for Indicating Message Authentication Status (https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8601)

### DMARC alignment validated — Met — 20 pts

DMARC alignment verified on a single transactional message

20 points out of 20 — met on 1 of 1 transactional message concerned.

Met when the domain shown in the sender matches the one that authenticated the message.

RFC 9989 · PM-DELIV-002

RFC 9989 — Domain-Based Message Authentication, Reporting, and Conformance (DMARC) (https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9989)

### DMARC policy that helps keep out some impersonation — Not met — 0/15 pts

DMARC policy in observation only on the only transactional message concerned

0 points out of 15 — met on 0 of 1 transactional message concerned.

**How to fix it**

A `_dmarc.<domain>` TXT record declares the policy: `v=DMARC1; p=quarantine; rua=mailto:…` at the very least, `p=reject` once the sending sources are aligned. The move happens in stages (p=none with reports, then `quarantine`, then `reject`) over a few weeks, reading the reports to find the tools that send on behalf of the domain.

A none policy prevents no spoofing of the domain; `quarantine` or `reject` closes the door and meets the Gmail and Yahoo requirements for bulk senders.

Met when the published policy is “reject” or “quarantine”. A “none” policy asks nothing of mail providers: it is published with no effect on messages that impersonate the domain.

RFC 9989 §4.7 · PM-DELIV-003 · RFC 9989 — section 4.7, “p” tag (https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9989#section-4.7)

### No SPF failure — Met — 10 pts

No SPF failure on a single transactional message

10 points out of 10 — met on 1 of 1 transactional message concerned.

Met when SPF does not fail. An SPF “none” alongside a valid DKIM and DMARC is a common and legitimate configuration: it is not penalized.

RFC 7208 · PM-DELIV-004

RFC 7208 — Sender Policy Framework (SPF) for Authorizing Use of Domains in Email (https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7208)

### One-click unsubscribe, as defined by RFC 8058 — Not applicable — not applicable

This measurement did not apply to any of the emails received. It **drops out of the denominator**: it is never counted as a failure.

Met when the “List-Unsubscribe” header carries an https address and “List-Unsubscribe-Post” is exactly “List-Unsubscribe=One-Click”. This is what Gmail and Yahoo require of bulk senders: the mailbox's button then acts without opening a page. Not applicable to a transactional email.

RFC 8058 · Gmail et Yahoo · PM-DELIV-005

### A DKIM signature that covers what matters — Met — 5 pts

The DKIM signature covers what matters in the message on a single transactional message

5 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 1 transactional message.

What the signature covers, not only that it passes: an algorithm accepted by RFC 8301, the whole body signed, the From, Subject, Date and List-Unsubscribe headers signed, a signature not expired on receipt. Not applicable without a DKIM signature.

What was measured — 3 met out of 3

- Accepted signing algorithm on a single transactional message — Met
- Whole body signed on a single transactional message — Met
- Essential headers signed on a single transactional message — Met
- Signature valid on receipt — Not applicable

RFC 6376 · RFC 8301 · PM-DELIV-006

---




## Technical

These checks cover what email clients actually do with the message: truncation, style blocks removed, resources never loaded. Each threshold states where it comes from: the documented behaviour of an email client, a specification, or our own method.

Support by email client (caniemail) ↗ (https://www.caniemail.com/) Method, Technical family

better than 8% of the 643 brands measured

**The calculation** · 55 pts out of 85, scaled to 100 — 4 met · 2 not met




Weight of each criterion in the score.

### HTML under Gmail's clipping threshold — Met — 25 pts

HTML under Gmail's clipping threshold on a single transactional message

25 points out of 25 — met on 1 of 1 transactional message concerned.

Met when the HTML part stays under 102 KB. Beyond that, Gmail cuts off the end of the message — and the end is where the unsubscribe link and the notices are.

Gmail · PM-TECH-001

### A shallow template — Not met — 0/20 pts

Layout tables nested beyond the threshold on the only transactional message concerned (0 of 1 measures met)

0 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 1 transactional message.

**How to fix it**

Flatten the template: one content block per table, placed directly in the main column, with no wrapper table around each section.

In a block-based editor, nesting usually comes from a section placed inside another, or a column inside a column. It is fixed once, in the template, not campaign by campaign.

The technical reading of the email gives the measured nesting and its threshold: it tells you when the fix has taken effect.

Met when layout tables are nested no more than 6 levels deep. Beyond that, the Word engine shared by desktop Outlook and the diverging clients each render the template their own way.

What was measured — 0 met out of 1

- Layout tables nested beyond the threshold on the only transactional message concerned — Not met

Postmetry · PM-TECH-002

### Well-formed HTML — Met

15 pts

Well-formed HTML on a single transactional message

15 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 1 transactional message.

A doctype, a character set declared in the document, balanced tags and unique identifiers. Each client repairs incomplete markup its own way, which is what makes rendering unpredictable. End tags that HTML makes optional do not count.

What was measured — 4 met out of 4

- Doctype declared on a single transactional message — Met
- Character set declared in the HTML on a single transactional message — Met
- Balanced tags on a single transactional message — Met
- Unique identifiers on a single transactional message — Met

WHATWG · PM-TECH-030

### Every link leads somewhere — Not met

0/10 pts

Some links lead nowhere on the only transactional message concerned

0 points out of 10 — met on 0 of 1 transactional message concerned.

**How to fix it**

Every link has an absolute https target; no `href="#"`, no `href=""`, no relative link and no `mailto:` without an address. Empty links most often come from a block copied from an earlier template, or from a button whose URL was never filled in in the editor.

An empty link loses the click and signals a message put together in a hurry; the fix is a review of the link list before sending, which most editors offer.

Met when no link is empty, reduced to "#" or written as "javascript:". Such a link leads nowhere, and most clients neutralise it. Not applicable if the message contains no link.

Postmetry · PM-TECH-031

### No remote stylesheet — Met

10 pts

No remote stylesheet on a single transactional message

10 points out of 10 — met on 1 of 1 transactional message concerned.

Met when the message calls no external stylesheet, through "link" or "@import". Several clients never load them. A font stylesheet does not count: without it, the text falls back to another font.

caniemail · PM-TECH-020 · <link> in an email — support by client (https://www.caniemail.com/features/html-link/)

### The message follows the shape of an email — Met

5 pts

The message follows the shape of an email on a single transactional message

5 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 1 transactional message.

Lines of 998 bytes at most, readable Message-ID and Date, a character set announced on every text part, a transfer encoding consistent with the content (RFC 5322, RFC 2045). Most servers tolerate

these deviations, each in its own way.

What was measured — 5 met out of 5

- Lines of 998 bytes at most on a single transactional message Met
- Well-formed Message-ID on a single transactional message Met
- Readable date on a single transactional message Met
- Character set announced on every text part on a single transactional message Met
- Consistent transfer encoding on a single transactional message Met

RFC5322·RFC2045 · PM-TECH-010

---




## Experience

Four questions about what becomes of the message once received: does it stay understandable, can the recipient still act, can a client render it, can a screen display it. Automatic detection only covers what is declared in the message.

WCAG 2.2 ↗ (https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG22/) Method, Experience family

better than 72% of the 643 brands measured

**The calculation** · 70 pts out of 100 4 met ·1 partly met ·1 not met ·1 bonus




Weight of each criterion in the score.

### The message makes sense without its images, from the inbox on Met 25 pts

The message reads without its images and announces itself in the inbox on a single transactional message

25 points out of 25 — share of observations met across 1 transactional message.

Met when the message keeps at least 200 readable characters with images blocked, and a preheader of 40 to 130 characters announces it in the message list. Without a preheader, the inbox shows the first text of the body instead — often “View in browser”.

What was measured — 2 met out of 2

- At least 200 characters remain readable with images blocked on a single transactional message Met
- Preheader of 40 to 130 characters on a single transactional message Met

Postmetry · PM-EXP-001

### The message can be rendered outside HTML Not met 0/15 pts

No plain-text version accompanies the message on the only transactional message concerned (0 of 1 measures met)

0 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 1 transactional message.

**How to fix it**

The text version (`text/plain`) comes with the HTML and carries the content and the links, not just a sentence saying “open this message in your browser”. Email platforms generate it from the HTML when the option is on (“auto-generate plain text”).

This is the version that watches, screen readers and some business clients read; spam filters also use it, comparing the two versions.

Met when a text version comes with the email and carries the essentials: at least 60% of its text and 80% of its links. A client that does not display HTML falls back on it; reduced to "view the web version", it renders nothing.

What was measured — 0 met out of 1

- No plain-text version accompanies the message on the only transactional message concerned — Not met
- The text version carries the message's text — Not applicable
- The text version carries the message's links — Not applicable

Postmetry · PM-EXP-002

### All links stay visible with images blocked — Met — 15 pts

All links stay visible with images blocked on a single transactional message

15 points out of 15 — met on 1 of 1 transactional message concerned.

Met when no link is carried by a single image without alternative text: such a link leaves nothing on screen. Not applicable if the message contains no links.

Postmetry · PM-EXP-003

### Tap targets large enough — Met — 10 pts

Tap targets of sufficient size on a single transactional message

10 points out of 10 — met on 1 of 1 transactional message concerned.

Met when no sized tap target falls below 24 px a side (WCAG 2.2, criterion 2.5.8). Only targets with a declared dimension are measured; the criterion's exceptions — a target within a line of text, sufficient spacing — are not. Not applicable if the message declares no dimensions.

WCAG 2.2 — 2.5.8 · PM-EXP-004

WCAG 2.2 — Target Size (Minimum), success criterion 2.5.8, level AA (https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG22/#target-size-minimum)

### The message stays readable with assistive technology — Partly met — 5/20 pts

The message puts obstacles in the way of assistive technology — 1 of 4 measures met

5 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 1 transactional message.

**How to fix it**

Four fixes, all in the template: declare the message language on the `<html>` tag (`lang="en"` for an email in English), describe each content image in its `alt` attribute, mark layout tables with `role="presentation"`, and write links that say where they lead rather than "click here".

The criterion detail shows which ones are missing from your emails; the others are already met.

A decorative image — divider, spacer — keeps an empty `alt=""`: that is what keeps it silent, not an oversight.

Declared language, described content images, layout tables marked as such, link texts that say where they lead: what a screen reader needs to render the message. The detail says which of these measures is missing.

What was measured — 1 met out of 4

- Message language not declared on the only transactional message concerned — Not met
- Some content images are not described on the only transactional message concerned — Not met
- Layout tables announced as data tables on the only transactional message concerned — Not met
- Every link says where it leads on a single transactional message — Met

WCAG 2.2 · RGAA · PM-EXP-005

HTML Standard — The lang and xml:lang attributes (https://html.spec.whatwg.org/multipage/dom.html#the-lang-and-xml:lang-attributes)

HTML Standard — Requirements for providing text to act as an alternative for images (https://html.spec.whatwg.org/multipage/images.html#alt)

### The message declares its adaptation to screens

Met

15 pts

The message declares its adaptation to screens on a single transactional message

15 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 1 transactional message.

Met when the message declares its viewport and its adaptation to screen width. Without them, it displays on a phone at its original width, and is read by zooming and scrolling sideways.

What was measured — 2 met out of 2

- Viewport declared on a single transactional message — Met
- Adaptation to screen width declared on a single transactional message — Met

W3C · PM-EXP-026 · CSS Device Adaptation — the viewport tag (https://www.w3.org/TR/css-device-adapt-1/)
Media Queries Level 4 (https://www.w3.org/TR/mediaqueries-4/)

### Dark mode declared

Bonus point not earned

+0 pts

The message does not declare its support for dark mode on the only transactional message concerned

0 points out of 5 — met on 0 of 1 transactional message concerned.

Earned when the message declares `color-scheme` or a `prefers-color-scheme` rule. No standard requires it — clients that force dark mode invert the colors themselves — but declaring it leaves control to the template rather than to the mail client.

caniemail · PM-EXP-027

## Does this address really send Des Petits Hauts's emails?

DKIM d=despetitshauts.com · SPF pass · DKIM pass · DMARC pass · 1 transactional

Across 1 transactional message from Des Petits Hauts received at our addresses, in October 2026:

| | |
|---|---|
| From field | `eshop@despetitshauts.com` · 1 of 1 |
| DKIM signing domain (d=) | `despetitshauts.com` · 1 of 1 |
| Verdict on receipt | **SPF** pass · 1 of 1<br>**DKIM** pass · 1 of 1<br>**DMARC** pass · 1 of 1 |

The verdict is the one the receiving server wrote in the Authentication-Results header when the message arrived: it is read, never recomputed.

These findings describe the emails received at our addresses. They say nothing about a message received elsewhere: the From field can be written freely, and only the headers of the message you received show the path it took.

## Sector comparison

**Fashion & retail** — 148 brands with at least one campaign analyzed. The shares below are counted on them, never on the catalog.

148 brands analyzed in this sector

Reserved for the Pro version

Reading notes

## How to read this page

01 **A criterion that is not observable or not applicable leaves the calculation.** It stays listed, never counted as zero: its weight leaves the denominator rather than weighing as a failure.

02 Each line describes an **observable finding**, with the excerpt that establishes it. No legal qualification is ever attached to it.

03 The measurements come from **deterministic analyzers**: the same message always gives the same result, and a disputed finding can be redone identically from the archive.

04 Every share is published **on an observed basis**, and names it: “26 of 30 brands analyzed.” A brand with no email received enters no denominator.

05 The **deliverability score is borrowed**: its verdict comes from the server that received the message. All the other families come from our own analyzers.

---

Does this analysis speak to you?

## Let's go through it together, in 20 minutes.

We go over the 8 points with you, the evidence for each and the order in which to fix them. By video call, no commitment.

Pick a time slot : https://cal.com/noam-ouaknine-ecibnn/20min (https://cal.com/noam-ouaknine-ecibnn/20min)

### Get Des Petits Hauts's changes

One email when a criterion changes state, nothing else.

### Do you work at Des Petits Hauts?

Claim the brand: transactional emails, alerts, dated evidence.

### The Pro version

Full history, before and after, alerts.

This report can also be read online, with a preview of each email:
https://postmetry.com/en/marque/des-petits-hauts/?kind=transactional