

TEXT Report Review Checklist

LEV Thorough Examination & Test (TEXT)

A practical checklist for Duty Holders
reviewing LEV TEXT reports and
supporting evidence

DHC-004



Practical
Checklist



For Duty
Holders



Review with
Confidence



Evidence for
Assurance

OXYL8 Professional Publications

Purpose & How to Use the Checklist

This checklist is intended to help Duty Holders review completed Thorough Examination and Test (TExT) reports for Local Exhaust Ventilation (LEV) systems.

It focuses on whether the TExT appears to have covered the relevant system, whether the recorded evidence is sufficient to support the findings, and whether the report gives the Duty Holder clear information on system condition, control performance and any actions required.

It is a practical workplace aid.

It is intended to complement, not replace, competent technical review, professional judgement, formal LEV training or recognised qualifications.

A “Yes” response means that the report contains the relevant information and that it appears adequate for a Duty Holder review.

It does not, by itself, prove that the examination was competent, that every technical conclusion is correct or that the LEV system is compliant or effective.

A “No” or “Not clear” response should normally prompt clarification, further evidence, corrective action or competent professional review before the report is accepted as an adequate record of the TExT.

Use the checklist when:

- reviewing a completed initial, periodic or repeat LEV TExT report;
- checking whether the examination scope and recorded evidence cover the relevant LEV system, hoods and process;
- considering whether measurements, observations and conclusions are supported by suitable evidence; and
- deciding whether the report can be accepted, whether clarification is required, or whether further competent review or action is needed.

Response	Meaning
Yes	Evidence is present and appears adequate
No	Required evidence is absent or inadequate
Not clear	Clarification or competent review is needed
N/A	Not applicable to this system

A completed checklist does not certify an LEV system as compliant or effective.

Where evidence is incomplete or technically unclear, obtain competent professional advice before accepting the report.

DHC-004 Version 1.2 Aug 2026

Copyright © OXYL8 Ltd 2026.

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part for the purpose of reviewing LEV Thorough Examination and Test reports, provided that the source is acknowledged and the content is not altered in a way that misrepresents its original intent.

Part A: Report identification, scope and competence

Question	Yes	No	Not clear	N/A
Does the report clearly identify the site, LEV system, process or area examined?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does it state the date of examination and whether the TExT was initial, periodic or a repeat examination?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does it identify the examining organisation and the individual examiner(s) responsible for the work?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is relevant evidence of the examiner's training, qualifications, knowledge and experience stated or otherwise available?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does the report clearly define the scope of the examination, including the systems, hoods, branches and processes covered?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are any excluded systems, inaccessible areas, production constraints or other limitations clearly stated?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does the report identify the information used as the basis for comparison, such as commissioning data, design information or previous TExT results?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does it state the examination methodology and the relevant operating conditions during the examination?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Where representative operation was not possible, is the alternative test condition or simulation described and justified?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are the instruments used, measurement locations and relevant calibration details identified?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does the report clearly distinguish measured information, observations, assumptions and professional judgement?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are photographs, drawings, system references or other identifiers sufficient to relate findings to the correct equipment and locations?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is the report formally issued, dated and authenticated by the examining organisation or responsible examiner?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Part B: Examination, testing and supporting evidence

Question	Yes	No	Not clear	N/A
Does the report include a visual examination of the LEV system and record its general condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does it assess each relevant hood or control point in relation to the process and contaminant source?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are suitable qualitative observations of capture, containment or control effectiveness recorded?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are appropriate quantitative measurements recorded at hoods, ducts, fans, filters or other relevant points?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are measurement units, locations and test conditions sufficiently clear for the results to be understood and repeated?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are current measurements compared directly with commissioning benchmarks, design values or other suitable reference information?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Where previous TExT data are relevant, are significant changes or trends identified and explained?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are gauges, indicators, alarms, interlocks and other control devices examined where fitted?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are filters, air-cleaning devices and relevant pressure or condition indicators examined and recorded where applicable?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are discharge arrangements and any recirculation provisions examined where relevant to the system?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does the report record defects, deterioration, damage, blockages, leaks or other matters that could affect performance?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does the examination address whether the LEV appears to provide adequate control under the conditions examined?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Where the evidence is uncertain or contradictory, is this uncertainty clearly identified rather than hidden by a simple pass/fail statement?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are any limitations that could materially affect the reliability of the examination findings clearly explained?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does the body of evidence appear sufficient to support the conclusions reached in the report?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Part C: Findings, conclusions and required actions

Question	Yes	No	Not clear	N/A
Are defects and shortfalls described clearly enough for the Duty Holder to understand what is wrong and where?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are serious or urgent matters clearly distinguished from routine maintenance or improvement recommendations?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Where immediate action was required, does the report record how and when the Duty Holder or responsible person was notified?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are recommendations specific, practicable and linked to the relevant finding or evidence?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does the report avoid presenting unverified remedial work as though the defect has already been resolved?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Where remedial action may change system performance, does the report identify the need for appropriate verification or recommissioning?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does the report state a clear conclusion for the LEV system that is consistent with the recorded evidence?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Where a system or part of a system is considered unsatisfactory, is the basis for that conclusion clearly explained?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does the report distinguish the condition of the engineering system from the wider question of whether exposure is adequately controlled?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are significant departures from commissioning benchmarks or expected performance highlighted and explained?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is the date or basis for the next statutory TExT clearly stated?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are outstanding actions, responsibilities or follow-up requirements clear enough for the Duty Holder to manage?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Does the report provide sufficient information to update the LEV logbook or other system record?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Would another competent person be able to understand what was examined, what was found and why the conclusions were reached?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Overall, does the report provide the Duty Holder with a clear, evidence-based record on which to make informed management decisions?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Duty Holder TExT report review

Site / organisation:

LEV system(s) / reference:

TExT report reference / date:

Examining contractor / examiner:

Date reviewed:

Reviewed by: _____

Section review summary

- ☐ Report identity, scope and competence information appears adequate
- ☐ Examination, testing and supporting evidence appear adequate
- ☐ Findings, conclusions and required actions appear clear and supported

Overall report review decision

- ☐ Report accepted as an adequate TExT record
- ☐ Accept subject to clarification or additional evidence
- ☐ Do not accept pending correction, further examination or additional evidence
- ☐ Refer for competent independent review

Basis of decision / clarification required:

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Clarifications, actions and follow-up

Record any clarification, missing evidence, correction, further examination or action arising from the Duty Holder review.

Where the report is accepted subject to clarification or action, the Duty Holder should retain the contractor response and evidence that each matter has been resolved or appropriately incorporated into the LEV management record.

Action schedule

Action / clarification	Responsible person	Target date	Completed
			☐
			☐
			☐
			☐
			☐
			☐

Final report review completed by: _____

Date: _____ Signature: _____

Important limitation

This checklist supports a structured Duty Holder review.

It does not certify the competence of the examiner, validate every measurement or conclusion, certify the LEV system as compliant or effective, or replace the need for competent examination, professional judgement, suitable management arrangements or advice where required.



Further OXYL8 Professional Publications are available at
www.oxyl8.com