



Canadian International  
Trade Tribunal

Tribunal canadien du  
commerce extérieur

CANADIAN  
INTERNATIONAL  
TRADE TRIBUNAL

# Procurement

---

## DETERMINATION

File PR-2025-016

École de langues Eagle Inc.

v.

Department of Public Works and  
Government Services

*Determination issued  
Thursday, October 23, 2025*

IN THE MATTER OF a complaint filed by École de langues Eagle Inc. pursuant to subsection 30.11(1) of the *Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act*;

AND FURTHER TO a decision to conduct an inquiry into the complaint pursuant to subsection 30.13(1) of the *Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act*.

**BETWEEN**

**ÉCOLE DE LANGUES EAGLE INC.**

**Complainant**

**AND**

**THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES**

**Government Institution**

**DETERMINATION**

Pursuant to subsection 30.14(2) of the *Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act* (CITT Act), the Canadian International Trade Tribunal determines that the complaint is valid.

Pursuant to subsections 30.15(2) and (3) of the CITT Act, the Tribunal recommends that the Department of Public Works and Government Services (PWGSC) conduct a re-evaluation of the offer submitted by École de langues Eagle Inc. (ELE) in response to the request for standing offer for both in-person (Stream 1) and virtual (Stream 2) second language education and training services, in accordance with the following directions.

In re-evaluating ELE's offer for Stream 1 against Rated Technical Criterion (RTC) 1, PWGSC must consider the information provided by ELE in its email dated May 21, 2025, in response to a request for clarification, including ELE's statement that all of the experience listed in its April 25, 2025, offer led to the Public Service Commission's Second Language Evaluation (SLE) test, and its explanation concerning what was meant by the term "skill maintenance" in its offer. PWGSC must also interpret RTC1 as allowing the computation of hours of so-called "skill maintenance" as experience in delivering language training services leading to the SLE test.

In re-evaluating ELE's offer for both Stream 1 and Stream 2 against RTC2, RTC3, RTC4 and RTC5, PWGSC must consider the information provided by ELE in its emails dated May 21 and 22, 2025, in response to requests for clarification, which clearly indicated where in ELE's April 25, 2025, offer the detailed description of the work required for each RTC could be found, including the curriculum table and Annex 1. After having considered all the relevant information in ELE's April 25, 2025, offer aimed at demonstrating how it possessed the experience required by RTC2, RTC3, RTC4 and RTC5, including the sections noted above, PWGSC must determine if it demonstrates the required experience and assign a score to ELE's offer for each criterion.

If the re-evaluation results in ELE obtaining the required minimum of 5 points under each of RTC1 (for Stream 1) and RTC2, RTC3, RTC4 and RTC5 (for both Stream 1 and Stream 2), its offer must be declared compliant. In that event, PWGSC must proceed to add ELE's technical merit score and its pricing score to determine its combined rating for each stream.

If, applying the provisions of the solicitation documents governing the basis of selection, ELE's offer then becomes the highest-ranked responsive bid for Stream 1, or one of the five responsive bids with the highest combined rating for Stream 2, the Tribunal recommends that a standing offer be awarded to ELE.

PWGSC must proceed with the recommended re-evaluation and inform the Tribunal and ELE of the outcome within 30 calendar days from the date of the issuance of the reasons for this determination.

Pursuant to section 30.16 of the CITT Act, the Tribunal awards ELE its reasonable costs incurred in preparing and proceeding with this complaint, which costs are to be paid by PWGSC. In accordance with the *Procurement Costs Guidelines* (Guidelines), the Tribunal's preliminary indication of the level of complexity for this complaint is Level 1, and its preliminary indication of the amount of the cost award is \$1,150. If any party disagrees with the preliminary level of complexity or indication of the amount of the cost award, it may make submissions to the Tribunal, as contemplated in Article 4.2 of the Guidelines. The Tribunal reserves jurisdiction to establish the final amount of the cost award.

Georges Bujold  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Georges Bujold  
Presiding Member

The statement of reasons will be issued at a later date.