postmetry

I

What's inside the newsletter from

# Ilia

| | |
|---|---|
| Sender | info@iliabeauty.com |
| Sending platform | Klaviyo |
| Sector | Beauty |
| Emails read | 2 campaigns |
| Period | November 2026 |

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

Overall score

A B C **D** 66/100 E F

The main finding

## An open-tracking pixel is present on all 2 campaigns.

It is the first of 10 points to fix. The highest score is deliverability (100/100), the lowest compliance (45/100), better than 61% of the 640 brands measured.

**Marketing**
2 campaigns

November 2026 · calculated on 22 November

### Compliance

**45** /100

better than 61% of the 640 brands measured

### Deliverability

**100** /100

better than 43% of the 640 brands measured

### Technical

**65** /100

better than 15% of the 640 brands measured

### Experience

**52** /100

better than 21% of the 640 brands measured

## 10 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 all 2 campaigns<br>`<img src="https://trk.send.iliabeauty.com/o/***" alt="" width="1" height="1" bo…`<br>Klaviyo: open tracking is set per campaign and per flow, in the tracking settings. | −30 pts<br>out of 30 in Compliance |
| Priority | **Layout tables nested beyond the threshold**<br>Criterion “A shallow template” · Technical · measured on 2 campaigns<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 2 campaigns<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 | **Some links become invisible when images are blocked**<br>Criterion “All links stay visible with images blocked” · Experience · on all 2 campaigns | −15 pts<br>out of 15 in Experience |
| To review | **Preheader missing, too short or too long**<br>Criterion “The message makes sense without its images, from the inbox on” · Experience · measured on 2 campaigns | −12.5 pts<br>out of 25 in Experience |
| To review | **No untracked path leads to the site**<br>Criterion “An untracked path leads to the site” · Compliance · on all 2 campaigns | −10 pts<br>out of 10 in Compliance |
| To review | **No separate path to refuse tracking**<br>Criterion “The recipient keeps control over tracking” · Compliance · measured on 2 campaigns | −10 pts<br>out of 20 in Compliance |
| To review | **A remote stylesheet is called**<br>Criterion “No remote stylesheet” · Technical · on all 2 campaigns | −10 pts<br>out of 10 in Technical |
| Secondary | **The text version carries less than 80% of the links**<br>Criterion “The message can be rendered outside HTML” · Experience · measured on 2 campaigns | −5 pts<br>out of 15 in Experience |
| Secondary | **No link leads to the privacy policy**<br>Criterion “The message says who is writing and under which rules” · Compliance · measured on 2 campaigns | −5 pts<br>out of 15 in Compliance |

**14 criteria met**, including « Unsubscribing is possible and announced » 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 November. Tap a dot to open it; the arrows move from one send to the next.

Technical reading of the send of Nov. 6, 2026 →

**2**
campaigns in 1 week
about 2 a week, in November

**No fixed day**
sending day
Thursday leads, 1 of the 2 campaigns

**14 h – 17 h**
arrival window
2 of the 2 campaigns

**6 Nov.**
last send received
« ILIA VIPs get more »




Campaign 2 of 2

Friday 6 Nov., 14:57

### ILIA VIPs get more

| | |
|---|---|
| Type | Marketing campaign |
| Score | 66 / 100 |
| Pixel | Present, detected by its size |

### Sending day

Tap a bar to find its sends on the timeline.

### Arrival time

Hour by hour, on the 2 campaigns.







**No change observed since November** Each campaign is compared with the previous one, criterion by criterion.

## Criteria in detail

The 24 criteria + 1 bonus

**14** met · **5** partly met · **5** not met · **0** not observable




### 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 61% of the 640 brands measured

**The calculation** · 45 pts out of 100 — 2 met · 2 partly met · 2 not met




Weight of each criterion in the score.

#### No open-tracking pixel — Not met — 0/30 pts

Open-tracking pixel detected on the 2 campaigns concerned

0 points out of 30 — met on 0 of 2 campaigns 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 `iliabeauty.com`.

The excerpt that establishes it

```
<img src="https://trk.send.iliabeauty.com/o/***" alt="" width
="1" height="1" border="0" style="height:1px !important;widt
h:1px !important;border-width:0 !important;margin-top:0 !impo
rtant;margin-bottom:0 !important;margin-right:0 !important;ma
rgin-left:0 !important;padding-top:0 !important;padding-botto
m:0 !important;padding-right:0 !important;padding-left:0 !imp
ortant;">
```

**How to fix it**

Klaviyo: open tracking is set per campaign and per flow, in the **tracking settings**. Watch out for automated flows: the setting there is separate from the campaigns' one.

Specific to klaviyo — not yet re-opened in the tool

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

### Unsubscribing is possible and announced

Met

15 pts

Unsubscribing is announced,in the header and in the body on 2 campaigns

15 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

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.

What was measured — 2 met out of 2

- Unsubscribe announced in the header, through a page on 2 campaigns Met
- Unsubscribe link in the body on 2 campaigns Met

RFC 2369 · PM-PRIV-002

RFC 2369 — The Use of URLs as Meta-Syntax for Core Mail List Commands (https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2369)

### The recipient keeps control over tracking

Partly met

10/20 pts

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

10 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

**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 2 campaigns Met
- No separate path to refuse tracking on the 2 campaigns concerned Not met

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

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

Partly met

10/15 pts

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

10 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

**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 2 campaigns — Met
- A reply to the message is possible on 2 campaigns — Met
- No link leads to the privacy policy on the 2 campaigns concerned — Not met

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

### An untracked path leads to the site — Not met — 0/10 pts

Every link to the site goes through a tracker on the 2 campaigns concerned

0 points out of 10 — met on 0 of 2 campaigns concerned.

A recipient who simply wants to visit the site has no option but to go through the click counter.

**How to fix it**

At least one link in the message points directly to the brand's domain, without going through the platform's redirect domain: the logo, the legal notice or the privacy policy will do. In the editor this is set link by link ("do not track this link", "disable click tracking") or through an exclusion list in the account settings.

An untracked link does not count in measured clicks; choosing the logo or the footer takes nothing away from the clicks that matter.

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 2 campaigns

10 points out of 10 — met on 2 of 2 campaigns 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

100
out of 100

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 43% of the 640 brands measured

**The calculation** · 85 pts out of 85, scaled to 100 — 6 met




Weight of each criterion in the score.

### DKIM signature validated — Met — 20 pts

Valid DKIM signature on 2 campaigns

20 points out of 20 — met on 2 of 2 campaigns 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 2 campaigns

20 points out of 20 — met on 2 of 2 campaigns 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 — Met — 15 pts

Active DMARC policy on 2 campaigns

15 points out of 15 — met on 2 of 2 campaigns concerned.

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 2 campaigns

10 points out of 10 — met on 2 of 2 campaigns 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 Met

15 pts

One-click unsubscribe as defined by RFC 8058 on 2 campaigns

15 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

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.

What was measured — 2 met out of 2

- The unsubscribe header carries an https address on 2 campaigns Met
- One-click unsubscribe announced on 2 campaigns Met

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 2 campaigns

5 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

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 2 campaigns Met
- Whole body signed on 2 campaigns Met
- Essential headers signed on 2 campaigns 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 15% of the 640 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 2 campaigns

25 points out of 25 — met on 2 of 2 campaigns 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 2 campaigns concerned (0 of 1 measures met)

0 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

**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 2 campaigns concerned — Not met

Postmetry · PM-TECH-002

### Well-formed HTML — Met — 15 pts

Well-formed HTML on 2 campaigns

15 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

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 2 campaigns — Met
- Character set declared in the HTML on 2 campaigns — Met
- Balanced tags on 2 campaigns — Met
- Unique identifiers on 2 campaigns — Met

WHATWG · PM-TECH-030

### Every link leads somewhere — Met — 10 pts

Every link leads somewhere on 2 campaigns

10 points out of 10 — met on 2 of 2 campaigns concerned.

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

Not met

0/10 pts

Remote stylesheet declared on the 2 campaigns concerned

0 points out of 10 — met on 0 of 2 campaigns concerned.

**How to fix it**

CSS rules go inside the message, in a `<style>` block or inline on the elements; no `<link rel="stylesheet">` and no `@import` pointing to a server. Remote fonts are not counted here: most clients ignore them, but they break nothing.

Gmail, Outlook and most clients do not load a remote stylesheet: the message shows without its styles for most readers.

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 2 campaigns

5 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

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 2 campaigns — Met
- Well-formed Message-ID on 2 campaigns — Met
- Readable date on 2 campaigns — Met
- Character set announced on every text part on 2 campaigns — Met
- Consistent transfer encoding on 2 campaigns — Met

RFC 5322 · RFC 2045 · 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 21% of the 640 brands measured

**The calculation** · 52 pts out of 100

2 met · 3 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

Partly met

12.5/25 pts

Preheader missing, too short or too long on the 2 campaigns concerned (1 of 2 measures met)

12.5 points out of 25 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

**How to fix it**

A preheader of 40 to 130 characters, in real text, follows the subject in the inbox; every meaningful image has an `alt` attribute that says what it shows; the main message is in text, not inside an image. In the editor, the preheader is a dedicated field, and the `alt` is filled in image by image.

Half of readers see the message without images when it first opens. An `alt` and a preheader take a minute per campaign.

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 — 1 met out of 2

- At least 200 characters remain readable with images blocked on 2 campaigns — Met
- Preheader missing, too short or too long on the 2 campaigns concerned — Not met

Postmetry · PM-EXP-001

### The message can be rendered outside HTML

Partly met

10/15 pts

The text version carries less than 80% of the links on the 2 campaigns concerned (2 of 3 measures met)

10 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

**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 — 2 met out of 3

- A plain-text version accompanies the message on 2 campaigns — Met
- The text version carries at least 60% of the text on 2 campaigns — Met
- The text version carries less than 80% of the links on the 2 campaigns concerned — Not met

Postmetry · PM-EXP-002

### All links stay visible with images blocked

Not met

0/15 pts

Some links become invisible with images blocked on the 2 campaigns concerned

0 points out of 15 — met on 0 of 2 campaigns concerned.

**How to fix it**

Every important action (main button, unsubscribe) exists as text or as an HTML button, not only as a clickable image. For an image button, an `alt` that names the action and a background colour on the cell keep

the area visible even without the image.

With images blocked, an image button becomes an empty rectangle: the reader does not know where to click.

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 2 campaigns

10 points out of 10 — met on 2 of 2 campaigns 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 2 campaigns.

**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 2 campaigns concerned — Not met
- Some content images are not described on the 2 campaigns concerned — Not met
- Layout tables announced as data tables on the 2 campaigns concerned — Not met
- Every link says where it leads on 2 campaigns — 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 2 campaigns

15 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 2 campaigns.

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 2 campaigns Met
- Adaptation to screen width declared on 2 campaigns 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 2 campaigns concerned

0 points out of 5 — met on 0 of 2 campaigns 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 Ilia's emails?

DKIM d=send.iliabeauty.com · SPF pass · DKIM pass · DMARC pass · 2 campaigns

Across 2 campaigns from Ilia received at our addresses since November 2026:

| | |
|---|---|
| From field | `info@iliabeauty.com` · 2 of 2 |
| DKIM signing domain (d=) | `send.iliabeauty.com` · 2 of 2<br>`shared.klaviyomail.com` · 2 of 2 |
| Verdict on receipt | **SPF** pass · 2 of 2<br>**DKIM** pass · 2 of 2<br>**DMARC** pass · 2 of 2 |

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

**Beauty** — 85 brands with at least one campaign analyzed. The shares below are counted on them, never on the catalog.

85 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?

### Get Ilia's changes

One email when a criterion changes state, nothing else.

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

We go over the 10 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-

### Do you work at Ilia?

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/ilia/