postmetry

M

What's inside the newsletter from

Manelli

Sender	info@manelli.fr
Sending platform	Klaviyo
Sector	DIY & building
Emails read	8 campaigns, 3 transactional
Period	October 2026

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

Overall score

A B **C** 70/100 D E F

The main finding

An open-tracking pixel is present on 2 of the 3 transactional messages.

It is the first of 12 points to fix. The highest score is technical (87/100), the lowest compliance (51/100), better than 79% of the 566 brands measured.

Transactional
3 messages

October 2026 · calculated on 24 October

Compliance

51 /100

better than 79% of the 566 brands measured

Deliverability

77 /100

better than 6% of the 565 brands measured

Technical

87 /100

better than 53% of the 566 brands measured

Experience

79 /100

better than 90% of the 566 brands measured

12 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 2 of the 3 transactional messages

−23.3 pts
out of 35 in Compliance

```
<img src="https://trk.mailing.manelli.fr/o/***" alt="" width="1" height="1" bor…
```

Klaviyo: open tracking is set per campaign and per flow, in the tracking settings.

Priority

The recipient's address is written into the message

Criterion “No recipient identifier in the message” · Compliance · on 2 of the 3 transactional messages

−6.7 pts
out of 10 in Compliance

```
href adresse:clair · href adresse:url
```

Links carry no email address, contact identifier or automatic login token in their parameters.

To review

No untracked path leads to the site

Criterion “An untracked path leads to the site” · Compliance · on all 3 transactional messages

−15 pts
out of 15 in Compliance

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.

To review

The published DMARC policy keeps out no impersonation

Criterion “DMARC policy that helps keep out some impersonation” · Deliverability · on all 3 transactional messages

−15 pts
out of 15 in Deliverability

To review

Layout tables announced as data tables

Criterion “The message stays readable with assistive technology” · Experience · measured on 3 transactional messages

−10 pts
out of 20 in Experience

To review

A remote stylesheet is called

Criterion “No remote stylesheet” · Technical · on all 3 transactional messages

−10 pts
out of 10 in Technical

Secondary

The message does not declare its adaptation to screens

Criterion “The message declares its adaptation to screens” · Experience · measured on 3 transactional messages

−5 pts
out of 15 in Experience

Secondary

The message does not say who is writing or under which rules

Criterion “The message says who is writing and under which rules” · Compliance · measured on 3 transactional messages

−4.4 pts
out of 20 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 3 transactional messages

−4.2 pts
out of 25 in Experience

Secondary

The message cannot be rendered outside HTML

Criterion “The message can be rendered outside HTML” · Experience · measured on 3 transactional messages

−1.7 pts
out of 15 in Experience

Secondary	**The HTML shows formal deviations** Criterion “Well-formed HTML” · Technical · measured on 3 transactional messages	**−1.2 pts** out of 15 in Technical
Secondary	**The DKIM signature leaves part of the message uncovered** Criterion “A DKIM signature that covers what matters” · Deliverability · measured on 3 transactional messages	**−1.1 pts** out of 5 in Deliverability

10 criteria met, including « The recipient keeps control over tracking » 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. 4, 2026 →

8
campaigns in 2 weeks
about 4 a week, in October

No fixed day
sending day
Saturday leads, 3 of the 8 campaigns

9 h – 19 h
arrival window
8 of the 8 campaigns

24 Oct.
last send received
« 🆕 Du nouveau dans votre vestiaire pro ! »



Campaign 8 of 8

Saturday 24 Oct., 9:30

🆕 Du nouveau dans votre vestiaire pro !

Type Marketing campaign

Score	analysis in progress
Pixel	—

Sending day

Tap a bar to find its sends on the timeline.



Arrival time

Hour by hour, on the 8 campaigns.



2 changes observed since October

Each campaign is compared with the previous one, criterion by criterion.

13 Oct.	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 67 to 66
17 Oct.	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 66 to 71

Criteria in detail

The 24 criteria + 1 bonus

10 met · **9** partly met · **3** 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 79% of the 566 brands measured

The calculation · 51 pts out of 100

1 met · 3 partly met · 1 not met · 1 not applicable

Weight of each criterion in the score.

No open-tracking pixel · Partly met

11.7 / 35 pts

Open-tracking pixel detected (2 of 3 transactional messages concerned)

11.7 points out of 35 — met on 1 of 3 transactional messages 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 `manelli.fr`.

The excerpt that establishes it

```
<img src="https://trk.mailing.manelli.fr/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

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

Met

20 pts

The recipient keeps control over tracking on 2 transactional messages

20 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 2 transactional messages.

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 — 2 met out of 2

- Untracked unsubscribe link on 2 transactional messages — Met
- A separate path leads to a preference center or to refusing tracking on 2 transactional messages — Met

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

The message says who is writing and under which rules

Partly met

15.6/20 pts

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

15.6 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 3 transactional messages.

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 3 transactional messages — Met
- A reply to the message is possible on 3 transactional messages — Met
- No link leads to the privacy policy (2 of 3 transactional messages concerned) — Partly met

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

An untracked path leads to the site

Not met

0/15 pts

Every link to the site goes through a tracker on the 3 transactional messages concerned

0 points out of 15 — met on 0 of 3 transactional messages 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

Partly met

3.3/10 pts

The recipient's address is written into the message (2 of 3 transactional messages concerned)

3.3 points out of 10 — met on 1 of 3 transactional messages concerned.

Base64-encoded or hashed, it is still the address: a hash is recovered by hashing a list of known addresses. Placed in a URL or a header, it travels wherever the message goes — redirect server logs, analytics tools, browser history.

The excerpt that establishes it

```
href adresse:clair · href adresse:url
```

How to fix it

Links carry no email address, contact identifier or automatic login token in their parameters. In the email platform, these come from merge variables inserted into URLs (`?email={{contact.email}}`, `?uid=…`): remove them from the template's links, and turn off login-by-link if it is offered.

The platform still identifies the recipient for tracked clicks; what changes is that the address no longer travels in clear to the website, its analytics and its partners.

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

77
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 6% of the 565 brands measured

The calculation · 54 pts out of 70, scaled to 100

3 met · 1 partly met · 1 not met · 1 not applicable

20	20	15	10	5

Weight of each criterion in the score.

DKIM signature validated — Met

20 pts

Valid DKIM signature on 3 transactional messages

20 points out of 20 — met on 3 of 3 transactional messages 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 3 transactional messages

20 points out of 20 — met on 3 of 3 transactional messages 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 3 transactional messages concerned

0 points out of 15 — met on 0 of 3 transactional messages 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 3 transactional messages

10 points out of 10 — met on 3 of 3 transactional messages 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

Partly met

3.9/5 pts

Some essential headers escape the signature (2 of 3 transactional messages concerned) (2 of 3 measures met)

3.9 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 3 transactional messages.

How to fix it

The signature uses `rsa-sha256` (or ed25519) with a 2048-bit key, without the `l=` tag (body length), and covers the `From`, `Subject`, `Date` and `List-Unsubscribe` headers in `h=`. These settings belong to the email platform or the SMTP server; the key is regenerated from the domain authentication page when it is too short.

A signature with `l=` or a 1024-bit key is still valid today, but it lets content be added after signing and will be refused by filters as they tighten.

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 — 2 met out of 3

- Accepted signing algorithm on 3 transactional messages — Met

- Whole body signed on 3 transactional messages Met
- Some essential headers escape the signature (2 of 3 transactional messages concerned) Partly met
- Signature valid on receipt Not applicable

RFC 6376 · RFC 8301 · PM-DELIV-006

87
out of 100

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 53% of the 566 brands measured

The calculation · 74 pts out of 85, scaled to 100 — 4 met · 1 partly met · 1 not met

25	20	15	10	10	5

Weight of each criterion in the score.

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

HTML under Gmail's clipping threshold on 3 transactional messages

25 points out of 25 — met on 3 of 3 transactional messages 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 3 transactional messages

20 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 3 transactional messages.

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 3 transactional messages Met

Postmetry · PM-TECH-002

Well-formed HTML — Partly met — 13.8 / 15 pts

No doctype declared (1 of 3 transactional messages concerned) (3 of 4 measures met)

13.8 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 3 transactional messages.

How to fix it

Form errors (unclosed tags, duplicated attributes, invalid table/div nesting) come from blocks pasted between editors or from hand edits in the code. Run the HTML through a validator before sending, and fix it at the source in the template rather than in each campaign.

Malformed HTML renders differently from one email client to another, and it is the most common cause of a broken display in Outlook or on mobile.

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 — 3 met out of 4

- No doctype declared (1 of 3 transactional messages concerned) Partly met
- Character set declared in the HTML on 3 transactional messages Met
- Balanced tags on 3 transactional messages Met
- Unique identifiers on 3 transactional messages Met

WHATWG · PM-TECH-030

Every link leads somewhere Met

10 pts

Every link leads somewhere on 3 transactional messages

10 points out of 10 — met on 3 of 3 transactional messages 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 3 transactional messages concerned

0 points out of 10 — met on 0 of 3 transactional messages 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 3 transactional messages

5 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 3 transactional messages.

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 3 transactional messages Met
- Well-formed Message-ID on 3 transactional messages Met
- Readable date on 3 transactional messages Met

- Character set announced on every text part on 3 transactional messages Met
- Consistent transfer encoding on 3 transactional messages Met

RFC 5322 · RFC 2045 · PM-TECH-010

79
out of 100

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 90% of the 566 brands measured

The calculation · 79 pts out of 100 — 2 met · 4 partly met · 1 bonus

25	15	15	10	20	15

Weight of each criterion in the score.

The message makes sense without its images, from the inbox on — Partly met — 20.8/25 pts

Preheader missing, too short or too long (1 of 3 transactional messages concerned) (1 of 2 measures met)

20.8 points out of 25 — share of observations met across 3 transactional messages.

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 3 transactional messages Met
- Preheader missing, too short or too long (1 of 3 transactional messages concerned) Partly met

Postmetry · PM-EXP-001

The message can be rendered outside HTML — Partly met — 13.3/15 pts

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

13.3 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 3 transactional messages.

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 3 transactional messages Met
- The text version carries at least 60% of the text on 3 transactional messages Met
- The text version carries less than 80% of the links (1 of 3 transactional messages 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 3 transactional messages

15 points out of 15 — met on 3 of 3 transactional messages 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 2 transactional messages

10 points out of 10 — met on 2 of 2 transactional messages 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

10/20 pts

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

10 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 3 transactional messages.

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 (2 of 3 transactional messages concerned) Partly met

- Some content images are not described (1 of 3 transactional messages concerned) Partly met
- Layout tables announced as data tables on the 3 transactional messages concerned Not met
- Every link says where it leads on 3 transactional messages 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

10/15 pts

The message does not declare its adaptation to screens — none of the 2 measures is met across all 3 transactional messages

10 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 3 transactional messages.

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 — 0 met out of 2

- Viewport not declared (1 of 3 transactional messages concerned) Partly met
- No adaptation to screen width declared (1 of 3 transactional messages 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 not earned

+0 pts

The message does not declare its support for dark mode on the 3 transactional messages concerned

0 points out of 5 — met on 0 of 3 transactional messages 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

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 12 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 Manelli's changes

One email when a criterion changes state, nothing else.

Do you work at Manelli?

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/manelli/?kind=transactional