postmetry

N

What's inside the newsletter from

# Néogourmets

| | |
|---|---|
| Sender | contact@neogourmets.com |
| Sending platform | Klaviyo |
| Sector | Food |
| Emails read | 4 campaigns, 2 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** 63/100 E F

The main finding

## The recipient has no control over tracking measured on 1 transactional message.

It is the first of 12 points to fix. The highest score is deliverability (77/100), the lowest compliance (41/100), better than 66% of the 566 brands measured.

**Transactional**
2 messages

October 2026 · calculated on 24 October

### Compliance

**41** /100

better than 66% of the 566 brands measured

### Deliverability

**77** /100

better than 6% of the 565 brands measured

### Technical

**74** /100

better than 32% of the 566 brands measured

### Experience

**72** /100

better than 77% 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

### The recipient has no control over tracking

Criterion “The recipient keeps control over tracking” · Compliance · measured on 1 transactional message

**−20 pts**
out of 20 in Compliance

A path separate from the unsubscribe link leads to a preference centre where the recipient can refuse tracking (opens, clicks) without unsubscribing.

Priority

### An open-tracking pixel is present

Criterion “No open-tracking pixel” · Compliance · on 1 of the 2 transactional messages

**−17.5 pts**
out of 35 in Compliance

```
<img alt="facebook" src="https://cdn.klaviyomail.com/assets/email/buttons/subtl…
```

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

To review

### No untracked path leads to the site

Criterion “An untracked path leads to the site” · Compliance · on all 2 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 2 transactional messages

**−15 pts**
out of 15 in Deliverability

To review

### 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 2 transactional messages

**−12.5 pts**
out of 25 in Experience

To review

### A remote stylesheet is called

Criterion “No remote stylesheet” · Technical · on all 2 transactional messages

**−10 pts**
out of 10 in Technical

To review

### The template is nested beyond the threshold

Criterion “A shallow template” · Technical · measured on 2 transactional messages

**−10 pts**
out of 20 in Technical

Secondary

### Layout tables announced as data tables

Criterion “The message stays readable with assistive technology” · Experience · measured on 2 transactional messages

**−8.3 pts**
out of 20 in Experience

Secondary

### The message does not declare its adaptation to screens

Criterion “The message declares its adaptation to screens” · Experience · measured on 2 transactional messages

**−7.5 pts**
out of 15 in Experience

Secondary

### No link leads to the privacy policy

Criterion “The message says who is writing and under which rules” · Compliance · measured on 2 transactional messages

**−6.7 pts**
out of 20 in Compliance

Secondary

### The HTML shows formal deviations

Criterion “Well-formed HTML” · Technical · measured on 2 transactional messages

**−1.9 pts**
out of 15 in Technical

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Secondary | **The DKIM signature leaves part of the message uncovered**<br>Criterion “A DKIM signature that covers what matters” · Deliverability · measured on 2 transactional messages | **−0.8 pts**<br>out of 5 in Deliverability |

**10 criteria met**, including « No recipient identifier in the message » 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 →

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

**Saturday**
favourite sending day
3 of the 4 campaigns

**10 h**
favourite sending hour
50% of campaigns arrive between 10:00 and 11:00

**24 Oct.**
last send received
« On a hacké Halloween (7 recettes, zéro sucre ajouté) »




Campaign 4 of 4

Saturday 24 Oct., 10:02

### On a hacké Halloween (7 recettes, zéro sucre ajouté)

| | |
|---|---|
| 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 4 campaigns.




### 1 change observed since October

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

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 61

## Criteria in detail

The 24 criteria + 1 bonus

**10** met · **8** partly met · **4** 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 66% of the 566 brands measured

**The calculation** · 41 pts out of 100

1 met · 2 partly met · 2 not met · 1 not applicable

Weight of each criterion in the score.

### No open-tracking pixel — Partly met

17.5/35 pts

Open-tracking pixel detected (1 of 2 transactional messages concerned)

17.5 points out of 35 — met on 1 of 2 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 `klaviyomail.com`.

The excerpt that establishes it

```
<img alt="facebook" src="https://cdn.klaviyomail.com/assets/e
mail/buttons/subtleinverse/***" style="width:32px;" width="3
```

```
2">
```

**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

Not met

0/20 pts

The recipient has no control over tracking — none of the 2 measures is met

0 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 — 0 met out of 2

- Tracked unsubscribe link on the only transactional message concerned — Not 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 2 transactional messages concerned (2 of 3 measures met)

13.3 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 2 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 2 transactional messages — Met
- A reply to the message is possible on 2 transactional messages — Met
- No link leads to the privacy policy on the 2 transactional messages 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

0/15 pts

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

0 points out of 15 — met on 0 of 2 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

Met

10 pts

No recipient identifier in the message on 2 transactional messages

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

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 2 transactional messages

20 points out of 20 — met on 2 of 2 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 2 transactional messages

20 points out of 20 — met on 2 of 2 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 2 transactional messages concerned

0 points out of 15 — met on 0 of 2 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 2 transactional messages

10 points out of 10 — met on 2 of 2 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

4.2/5 pts

Some essential headers escape the signature (1 of 2 transactional messages concerned) (2 of 3 measures met)

4.2 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 2 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 2 transactional messages Met
- Whole body signed on 2 transactional messages Met
- Some essential headers escape the signature (1 of 2 transactional messages concerned) Partly met
- Signature valid on receipt Not applicable

RFC 6376 · RFC 8301 · PM-DELIV-006

## Technical

74
out of 100

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 32% of the 566 brands measured

**The calculation** · 63 pts out of 85, scaled to 100

3 met · 2 partly met · 1 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 transactional messages

25 points out of 25 — met on 2 of 2 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 Partly met

10/20 pts

Layout tables nested beyond the threshold (1 of 2 transactional messages concerned) (0 of 1 measures met)

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

**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 (1 of 2 transactional messages concerned) Partly met

Postmetry · PM-TECH-002

## Well-formed HTML

Partly met

13.1 / 15 pts

No doctype declared (1 of 2 transactional messages concerned) (3 of 4 measures met)

13.1 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 2 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 2 transactional messages concerned) Partly met
- Character set declared in the HTML on 2 transactional messages Met
- Balanced tags on 2 transactional messages Met
- Unique identifiers on 2 transactional messages Met

WHATWG · PM-TECH-030

## Every link leads somewhere

Met

10 pts

Every link leads somewhere on 2 transactional messages

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

0 points out of 10 — met on 0 of 2 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 2 transactional messages

5 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 2 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 2 transactional messages Met
- Well-formed Message-ID on 2 transactional messages Met
- Readable date on 2 transactional messages Met
- Character set announced on every text part on 2 transactional messages Met
- Consistent transfer encoding on 2 transactional messages Met

RFC 5322 · RFC 2045 · PM-TECH-010

---

## Experience

72
out of 100

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 77% of the 566 brands measured

**The calculation** · 72 pts out of 100

3 met · 3 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

12.5/25 pts

The message reads poorly without its images or does not announce itself in the inbox — none of the 2 measures is met across all 2 transactional messages

12.5 points out of 25 — share of observations met across 2 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 — 0 met out of 2

- ▢ Fewer than 200 characters remain readable with images blocked (1 of 2 transactional messages concerned) Partly met

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

Postmetry · PM-EXP-001

### The message can be rendered outside HTML Met

15 pts

A text version renders the message on 2 transactional messages

15 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 2 transactional messages.

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 — 3 met out of 3

- A plain-text version accompanies the message on 2 transactional messages Met
- The text version carries at least 60% of the text on 2 transactional messages Met
- The text version carries at least 80% of the links on 2 transactional messages Met

Postmetry · PM-EXP-002

### All links stay visible with images blocked Met

15 pts

All links stay visible with images blocked on 2 transactional messages

15 points out of 15 — met on 2 of 2 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 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

11.7 / 20 pts

The message puts obstacles in the way of assistive technology — 2 of 4 measures met

11.7 points out of 20 — share of observations met across 2 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 — 2 met out of 4

- Message language not declared (1 of 2 transactional messages concerned) Partly met
- Every content image is described on a single transactional message Met
- Layout tables announced as data tables on the 2 transactional messages concerned Not met
- Every link says where it leads on 2 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

7.5/15 pts

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

7.5 points out of 15 — share of observations met across 2 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 2 transactional messages concerned) Partly met
- No adaptation to screen width declared (1 of 2 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 2 transactional messages concerned

0 points out of 5 — met on 0 of 2 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

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 a tracking subdomain under the brand's name

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://trk.neogourmets.com/l/***
```

## Sector comparison

**Food** — 43 brands with at least one campaign analyzed. The shares below are counted on them, never on the catalog.

43 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 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 Néogourmets's changes

One email when a criterion changes state, nothing else.

### Do you work at Néogourmets?

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/neogourmets/?kind=transactional