postmetry

L

What's inside the newsletter from

LeoBelo

Sender	contact@leobelo.fr
Sending platform	Brevo
Emails read	4 campaigns, 2 transactional
Period	October – November 2026

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

Overall score

A B **C** 72/100 D E F

The main finding

An open-tracking pixel is present on the last 3 campaigns.

It is the first of 9 points to fix. The highest score is technical (100/100), the lowest compliance (43/100), better than 57% of the 640 brands measured.

Marketing
4 campaigns

October – November 2026 · calculated on 22 November

Compliance

43 /100

better than 57% of the 640 brands measured

Deliverability

82 /100

better than 5% of the 640 brands measured

Technical

100 /100

better than 90% of the 640 brands measured

Experience

85 /100

better than 94% of the 640 brands measured

9 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** Criterion “No open-tracking pixel” · Compliance · on the last 3 campaigns `<img style="display:none" src="https://fezoo.r.ag.d.sendibm3.com/mk/op/sh/***/*…` Brevo: open tracking is turned off in the campaign's advanced settings.	**−30 pts** out of 30 in Compliance
To review	**The published DMARC policy keeps out no impersonation** Criterion “DMARC policy that helps keep out some impersonation” · Deliverability · on all 4 campaigns 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.	**−15 pts** out of 15 in Deliverability
To review	**No separate path to refuse tracking** Criterion “The recipient keeps control over tracking” · Compliance · measured on 4 campaigns A path separate from the unsubscribe link leads to a preference centre where the recipient can refuse tracking (opens, clicks) without unsubscribing.	**−12.5 pts** out of 20 in Compliance
To review	**The message puts obstacles in the way of assistive technology** Criterion “The message stays readable with assistive technology” · Experience · measured on 4 campaigns	**−11.2 pts** out of 20 in Experience
To review	**No untracked path leads to the site** Criterion “An untracked path leads to the site” · Compliance · on all 4 campaigns	**−10 pts** out of 10 in Compliance
Secondary	**No link leads to the privacy policy** Criterion “The message says who is writing and under which rules” · Compliance · measured on 4 campaigns	**−5 pts** out of 15 in Compliance
Secondary	**The message reads poorly without its images or does not announce itself in the inbox** Criterion “The message makes sense without its images, from the inbox on” · Experience · measured on 4 campaigns	**−3.1 pts** out of 25 in Experience
Secondary	**The message does not declare its adaptation to screens** Criterion “The message declares its adaptation to screens” · Experience · measured on 4 campaigns	**−1.9 pts** out of 15 in Experience
Secondary	**The message cannot be rendered outside HTML** Criterion “The message can be rendered outside HTML” · Experience · measured on 4 campaigns	**−1.2 pts** out of 15 in Experience

15 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 October. Tap a dot to open it; the arrows move from one send to the next.

Technical reading of the send of Nov. 18, 2026 →

4
campaigns in 3 weeks
about one a week, from October to November

Wednesday
favourite sending day
2 of the 4 campaigns

14 h – 21 h
arrival window
4 of the 4 campaigns

18 Nov.
last send received
« 27 d'entre vous ont répondu : les crises »



Campaign 4 of 4

Wednesday 18 Nov., 17:42

27 d'entre vous ont répondu : les crises

Type Marketing campaign
Score 72 / 100
Pixel Present, detected by the form of its address

Sending day

Tap a bar to find its sends on the timeline.

Arrival time

Hour by hour, on the 4 campaigns.





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

11 Nov. — The detail of this change, criterion by criterion, is reserved for the Pro version.
confirmed by the next campaign · the per-send score goes from 71 to 72

Criteria in detail

The 24 criteria + 1 bonus

15 met · **6** partly met · **3** 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 57% of the 640 brands measured

The calculation · 43 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 last 3 campaigns

0 points out of 30 — met on 0 of the last 3 campaigns.

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 `sendibm3.com`.

The excerpt that establishes it

```
<img style="display:none" src="https://fezoo.r.ag.d.sendibm3.
com/mk/op/sh/***/***">
```

How to fix it

Brevo: open tracking is turned off in the campaign's **advanced settings**. For transactional emails, the setting is in the account's SMTP settings.

Specific to brevo — 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

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

Met

15 pts

Unsubscribing is announced, in the header and in the body on 4 campaigns

15 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 4 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 4 campaigns — Met
- Unsubscribe link in the body on 4 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

7.5/20 pts

The recipient has no control over tracking — none of the 2 measures is met across all 4 campaigns

7.5 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 4 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 — 0 met out of 2

- Tracked unsubscribe link (1 of 4 campaigns concerned) — Partly met
- No separate path to refuse tracking on the 4 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 4 campaigns concerned (2 of 3 measures met)

10 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 4 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 4 campaigns — Met
- A reply to the message is possible on 4 campaigns — Met
- No link leads to the privacy policy on the 4 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 4 campaigns concerned

0 points out of 10 — met on 0 of 4 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 4 campaigns

10 points out of 10 — met on 4 of 4 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



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 5% of the 640 brands measured

The calculation · 70 pts out of 85, scaled to 100

5 met · 1 not met



Weight of each criterion in the score.

DKIM signature validated — Met — 20 pts

Valid DKIM signature on 4 campaigns

20 points out of 20 — met on 4 of 4 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 4 campaigns

20 points out of 20 — met on 4 of 4 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 — Not met — 0 / 15 pts

DMARC policy in observation only on the 4 campaigns concerned

0 points out of 15 — met on 0 of 4 campaigns 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 4 campaigns

10 points out of 10 — met on 4 of 4 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 4 campaigns

15 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 4 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 4 campaigns — Met
- One-click unsubscribe announced on 4 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 4 campaigns

5 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 4 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 4 campaigns — Met
- Whole body signed on 4 campaigns — Met
- Essential headers signed on 4 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 90% of the 640 brands measured

The calculation · 85 pts out of 85, scaled to 100

6 met



Weight of each criterion in the score.

HTML under Gmail's clipping threshold

Met

25 pts

HTML under Gmail's clipping threshold on 4 campaigns

25 points out of 25 — met on 4 of 4 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

Met

20 pts

Shallow template on 4 campaigns

20 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 4 campaigns.

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 — 1 met out of 1

- Lightly nested layout tables on 4 campaigns — Met

Postmetry · PM-TECH-002

Well-formed HTML — Met — 15 pts

Well-formed HTML on 4 campaigns

15 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 4 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 4 campaigns — Met
- Character set declared in the HTML on 4 campaigns — Met
- Balanced tags on 4 campaigns — Met
- Unique identifiers on 4 campaigns — Met

WHATWG · PM-TECH-030

Every link leads somewhere — Met — 10 pts

Every link leads somewhere on 4 campaigns

10 points out of 10 — met on 4 of 4 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 — Met — 10 pts

No remote stylesheet on 4 campaigns

10 points out of 10 — met on 4 of 4 campaigns 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 4 campaigns

5 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 4 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 4 campaigns — Met
- Well-formed Message-ID on 4 campaigns — Met
- Readable date on 4 campaigns — Met
- Character set announced on every text part on 4 campaigns — Met
- Consistent transfer encoding on 4 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 94% of the 640 brands measured

The calculation · 85 pts out of 100 — 2 met · 4 partly met · 1 bonus



Weight of each criterion in the score.

The message makes sense without its images, from the inbox on

Partly met — 21.9/25 pts

Preheader missing, too short or too long (1 of 4 campaigns concerned) (1 of 2 measures met)

21.9 points out of 25 — share of observations met across 4 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 4 campaigns — Met
- Preheader missing, too short or too long (1 of 4 campaigns concerned) — Partly met

Postmetry · PM-EXP-001

The message can be rendered outside HTML

Partly met — 13.8/15 pts

The text version carries less than 80% of the links (1 of 4 campaigns concerned) (2 of 3 measures met)

13.8 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 4 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 4 campaigns — Met
- The text version carries at least 60% of the text on 4 campaigns — Met
- The text version carries less than 80% of the links (1 of 4 campaigns concerned) — Partly met

Postmetry · PM-EXP-002

All links stay visible with images blocked — Met

15 pts

All links stay visible with images blocked on 4 campaigns

15 points out of 15 — met on 4 of 4 campaigns 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 4 campaigns

10 points out of 10 — met on 4 of 4 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

8.8/20 pts

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

8.8 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 4 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 declared on 4 campaigns — Met
- Some content images are not described on the 4 campaigns concerned — Not met
- Layout tables announced as data tables on the 4 campaigns concerned — Not met
- Some links do not say where they lead (1 of 4 campaigns concerned) — Partly 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

Partly met

13.1 / 15 pts

No adaptation to screen width declared (1 of 4 campaigns concerned) (1 of 2 measures met)

13.1 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 4 campaigns.

How to fix it

The HTML has a `<meta name="viewport" content="width=device-width">` tag and `@media` rules that adapt the width and the columns below 600 px; the fixed 600 px width only holds for desktop clients. Modern editors produce them; an old or hand-made template often lacks them.

Without these rules, the message shows at 600 px on a 390 px screen: zooming required, unreadable text, links too small.

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 — 1 met out of 2

- Viewport declared on 4 campaigns — Met
- No adaptation to screen width declared (1 of 4 campaigns concerned) — Partly 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 partly earned

+2.5 pts

The message does not declare its support for dark mode (2 of 4 campaigns concerned)

2.5 points out of 5 — met on 2 of 4 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

FINDINGS OUTSIDE SCORING

Observed, not scored

These findings are not part of any score: their threshold has no citable source. They are still shown in full.

Every link in the message goes through a tracker

recognized by the form of the tracking link

Each click is recorded and tied to the recipient before being redirected. No link leads directly to the site: there is no way to visit the brand from this message without being measured.

▼ The evidence — excerpt from your email

```
https://fezoo.r.a.d.sendibm1.com/mk/cl/f/sh/***/***
```

Does this address really send LeoBelo's emails?

DKIM d=leobelo.fr · SPF pass · DKIM pass · DMARC pass · 4 campaigns

Across 4 campaigns from LeoBelo received at our addresses since October 2026:

From field	`contact@leobelo.fr` · 4 of 4
DKIM signing domain (d=)	`leobelo.fr` · 4 of 4
Verdict on receipt	**SPF** pass · 4 of 4 **DKIM** pass · 4 of 4 **DMARC** pass · 4 of 4

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.

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 LeoBelo's changes

One email when a criterion changes state, nothing else.

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

We go over the 9 points with you, the evidence for each and the order in which to fix them. By video call, no commitment.

Do you work at LeoBelo?

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/leobelo/