postmetry

S

What's inside the newsletter from

Selfridges

Sender	customerservices@selfridges.com
Sending platform	Salesforce Marketing Cloud
Emails read	1 campaign, 2 transactional
Period	November 2026

Our address received its first email in November 2026, after the CNIL recommendation was published (April 14, 2026).

Overall score

A B C **D** 62/100 E F

The main finding

An open-tracking pixel is present on all 2 transactional messages.

It is the first of 8 points to fix. The highest score is deliverability (100/100), the lowest compliance (20/100), better than 6% of the 643 brands measured.

Transactional
2 messages

November 2026 · calculated on 22 November

Compliance

20 /100

better than 6% of the 643 brands measured

Deliverability

100 /100

better than 42% of the 642 brands measured

Technical

76 /100

better than 34% of the 643 brands measured

Experience

69 /100

better than 71% of the 643 brands measured

8 points to fix

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

Priority

An open-tracking pixel is present

Criterion “No open-tracking pixel” · Compliance · on all 2 transactional messages

–35 pts
out of 35 in Compliance

```
<img src="http://click.mail.selfridges.com/open.aspx?qs=***&amp;d=***&amp;bmt=*…
```

Salesforce Marketing Cloud: tracking is on by default for Email Studio sends and is set at the “send definition” level.

Priority

The recipient has no control over tracking

Criterion “The recipient keeps control over tracking” · Compliance · measured on 2 transactional messages

–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

Layout tables nested beyond the threshold

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

–20 pts
out of 20 in Technical

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

Priority

The recipient's address is written into the message

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

–10 pts
out of 10 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 2 transactional messages

–15 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 2 transactional messages

–15 pts
out of 15 in Compliance

To review

Some links become invisible when images are blocked

Criterion “All links stay visible with images blocked” · Experience · on all 2 transactional messages

–15 pts
out of 15 in Experience

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 2 transactional messages

–6.2 pts
out of 25 in Experience

14 criteria met, including « The message says who is writing and under which rules » 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. 3, 2026 →

1

campaign in 1 week

about one a week, in November

No fixed day

sending day

Monday leads, 1 of the 1 campaigns

18 h – 19 h

arrival window

1 of the 1 campaigns

9 Nov.

last send received

« Vice City at The Corner Shop »



Pixel

Score 63

campaign · transactional · change observed · pixel present

Campaign 1 of 1

Monday 9 Nov., 18:36

Vice City at The Corner Shop

Type Marketing campaign

Score 63 / 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 campaign received.



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 · **2** partly met · **6** 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 6% of the 643 brands measured

The calculation · 20 pts out of 100 — 1 met · 4 not met · 1 not applicable



Weight of each criterion in the score.

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

Open-tracking pixel detected on the 2 transactional messages concerned

0 points out of 35 — met on 0 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 `selfridges.com`.

The excerpt that establishes it

```
<img src="http://click.mail.selfridges.com/open.aspx?qs=***&a
mp;d=***&amp;bmt=***" width="1" height="1" alt="">
```

How to fix it

Salesforce Marketing Cloud: tracking is on by default for Email Studio sends and is set at the "send definition" level. An email sent through the API can carry a different setting from the one in the interface.

Specific to salesforce-mc — 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

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 2 transactional messages.

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 2 transactional messages concerned — Not met
- No separate path to refuse tracking on the 2 transactional messages concerned — Not met

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

The message says who is writing and under which rules

Met

20 pts

The message says who is writing and under which rules on 2 transactional messages

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

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 — 3 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
- A link leads to the privacy policy on 2 transactional messages — 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

Not met

0/10 pts

The recipient's address is written into the message on the 2 transactional messages concerned

0 points out of 10 — met on 0 of 2 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

```
src adresse:clair
```

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

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 42% of the 642 brands measured

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

5 met · 1 not applicable



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 — Met — 15 pts

Active DMARC policy on 2 transactional messages

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

Met

5 pts

The DKIM signature covers what matters in the message on 2 transactional messages

5 points out of 5 — share of observations met across 2 transactional messages.

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 transactional messages — Met
- Whole body signed on 2 transactional messages — Met
- Essential headers signed on 2 transactional messages — 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 34% of the 643 brands measured

The calculation · 65 pts out of 85, scaled to 100

5 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

Not met

0/20 pts

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

0 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 on the 2 transactional messages concerned Not met

Postmetry · PM-TECH-002

Well-formed HTML Met

15 pts

Well-formed HTML on 2 transactional messages

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

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 transactional messages 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 Met

10 pts

No remote stylesheet on 2 transactional messages

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

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 71% of the 643 brands measured

The calculation · 69 pts out of 100

3 met · 2 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 — 18.8/25 pts

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

18.8 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 — 1 met out of 2

- At least 200 characters remain readable with images blocked on 2 transactional messages 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 — Not met — 0/15 pts

Some links become invisible with images blocked on the 2 transactional messages concerned

0 points out of 15 — met on 0 of 2 transactional messages 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 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 — 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 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 on the 2 transactional messages concerned — Not met
- Some content images are not described on the 2 transactional messages concerned — Not 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

Met

15 pts

The message declares its adaptation to screens on 2 transactional messages

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

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 transactional messages — Met
- Adaptation to screen width declared on 2 transactional messages — 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 earned

+5 pts

The message declares its support for dark mode on 2 transactional messages

5 points out of 5 — met on 2 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

```
http://click.mail.selfridges.com/?qs=***
```

```
http://click.mail.selfridges.com/?qs=***
```

Does this address really send Selfridges's emails?

DKIM d=mail.selfridges.com · SPF pass · DKIM pass · DMARC pass · 2 transactional

Across 2 transactional messages from Selfridges received at our addresses since November 2026:

From field	`customerservices@selfridges.com` · 1 of 2 `email@mail.selfridges.com` · 1 of 2
DKIM signing domain (d=)	`s10.y.mc.salesforce.com` · 2 of 2 `mail.selfridges.com` · 1 of 2
Verdict on receipt	**SPF** pass · 2 of 2 **DKIM** pass · 2 of 2 **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.

Reading notes

How to read this page

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

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

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

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

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

Does this analysis speak to you?

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

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

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

Get Selfridges's changes

One email when a criterion changes state, nothing else.

Do you work at Selfridges?

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/selfridges/?kind=transactional