

Graphic design print portfolio template

 I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

Portfolio plays a very important role in human life. This is nothing but a compiled version of materials that represent your skills, experiences, personality and beliefs, etc. The report page cover portfolio can be many types depending on the requirement. Some may just be cover art, while others may be full page cover letters. Our site has different page cover templates for your portfolio in an editable format, and you can download and print them for free. The General Page Model Portfolio ndsu.edu a Simple Page Pattern Portfolio webapps.tricities.wsu.edu The Standard Page Pattern Portfolio morgridge.du.edu Portfolio Page Template Example caee.org Portfolio Page Pattern Standard npenn.org Portfolio Page Pattern Download esu.edu Basic Portfolio Page Pattern concordia.ca If you have any DMCA questions on this post, please contact us! As a result of the trend of diversification in U.S. corporations, in which companies expand their product lines and enter new businesses, portfolio models have gained wider acceptance. General Electric is perhaps the most famous indicator of the portfolio approach. Models are divided into two common categories: standardized approaches, which usually focus on growth and market share, and individual varieties that provide greater flexibility in the measurements by which products or business lines are measured. This article outlines seven steps to take when evaluating an existing portfolio model or in developing a kind of approach. In our complex business environment, companies large and small constantly evaluate the compatibility of their strategy for each product or service - existing or planned - with the needs, resources, and goals of the organization. Should we be in this business? Should we add a new business? How can we win and retain a significant market share? In search of answers to such sensing questions, many companies view product range solutions as portfolio solutions. The company offers a different line of products, each of which requires a certain investment and promises a certain return on these investments. Given the operations, the role of top management is to identify the products (or businesses) that will make up the portfolio and give them funds on some rational basis. Over the past few years, a number of product portfolio models have emerged to assist management in this task. Examples include the growth/share matrix, the business profile matrix, the business valuation array, and the directional policy matrix. Exhibit I classifies these four models, as well as five others, which have also received recognition. Conceptually models differ in three ways: Exhibit I Selected Portfolio of Model Products and Approaches Lee Model general prescriptive framework or framework tailored to the needs of that particular company and its senior officials The dimensions used to build the model. The degree to which the model imposes rules on the allocation of resources between products. Exhibit II compares the nine illustrative approaches of the portfolio according to these three characteristics. Exhibit II Key characteristics of the nine portfolio models are the question facing the guide, which approach, if any, to choose from. To the extent that models produce the same results (strategic guidelines), the choice may not matter much. Recently, however, one of us compared three of these models and found that a set of products can be classified quite differently depending on the accepted model. And, more worryingly, product classification may also depend on the measures the model uses to build sizes and evaluate products. The importance of portfolio measurement aspects is evident even as a result of a cursory study of the different aspects and definitions that different approaches use. But surprisingly, most of the literature on portfolios was focused not on the fundamental issues of definition and measurement, but on the sale of a given approach and on strategic consequences, such as the status of a dog or a money cow of a product. We argue that when choosing a portfolio approach or evaluating a model already in use, management should pay more attention to the construction of the model and the likely sensitivity of the results (and therefore strategic conclusions) to the aspects used and their performance. Choosing the right measurements (and carefully assessing their measures) is one of the most important issues. Frameworks for analyzing the design of a product portfolio require seven main steps: 1. Setting a level and a unit of analysis and determining which links connect them. Identify relevant aspects, including one variable and composite. Determining the relative importance of measurements. 4. To the extent that two or more dimensions are considered dominant, the matrix is based on them. Accommodation of products or businesses in appropriate portfolio sizes. 6. Projecting the likely position of each product or enterprise by size if (a) no change is expected in environmental conditions, competition or company strategies and if (b) changes are expected. 7. Choosing the desired position for each existing and new product (as a basis for developing alternative strategies to bridge the gap between the current and new portfolios) and deciding how best to allocate resources between these products. Not present, the reader will notice, is a strategy recommendation pitch. Despite its appeal as a ready-made cure for any ailment, standardized guidelines such as all of the push for stocks and hold the position are very dangerous. If the recipe ignores any appropriate sizes or predictable business in alternative scenarios, this would be pretty misleading. Portfolio analysis can be to analyse and evaluate strategic options only if it uses the creativity and imagination of management, rather than conforming to any general mandate. The establishment of a level and group group At what level of organization should be analyzed? Ideally, at all strategic levels of business. And at the lowest level it

should include each product (by its positioning, if possible) by market segment. Such thoroughness, however, takes a lot of management time and requires huge amounts of data. On the other hand, aggregating product market segments may mean that they fall into a misleading middle position in a portfolio, which in turn can lead to an inappropriate design of the strategy. Consider the case of the manufacturer (among other products) shampoo, shaving cream, bath soaps, toothpaste and other personal care items, for which the single strategic business unit (SBU) is responsible. The company built a growth/share matrix, bringing this SBU as a cash cow. Now, obviously, this designation may be inappropriate for every line in the product range and, moreover, for each item in a row. Thus, aggregation can lead to erroneous positioning in the portfolio matrix, as well as poor allocation of resources and strategy recommendations. The hierarchical structure of portfolios will begin at the level of the product line (or product group or unit), move through the product range of one SBU to the combination of several SBU and will be completed at the corporate level, which, of course, will include all portfolios of the lower level. This would allow for the evaluation of relevant strategies at different levels of analysis and assist in the appointment and allocation of resources for THES and product lines. General Electric has a five-tier portfolio approach: product, product line, market segment, SBU and business sector. While this hierarchy represents a significant improvement over a single portfolio for the entire company, the complexity of modern business, especially with regard to competition between large corporations (increasingly on a global basis), demonstrates the need to develop a dual hierarchy - internal hierarchy plus the world. In addition, both hierarchies should be considered not only in accordance with the models of competition between brands and enterprises, but also in accordance with potential cooperation. That is, the company should ask itself: which companies or enterprises should we consider as candidates for merger or acquisition? The level of analysis is associated with the desired volume of market segmentation and product positioning. Portfolio analysis should be carried out first in all relevant market segments and product positions, then at higher levels in different product market segments, and finally if the company is multinational in different countries and ways of entering exports, licensing and joint ventures). The question here is when it becomes meaningful to divide the common market by And when to divide products into specific positioning? The answers become more complex when market boundaries cannot be easily defined. The risk of market aggregation and product positioning is high. Detailed portfolio analysis at the positioning/segment level is necessary for higher-level portfolio analysis. Without this, the value of corporate-level portfolio recommendations is questionable, especially when units are patchy with regard to their intended positioning and perceived market segments. According to one of the bodies, segmentation should be limited to grouping those buyers who have strategically relevant situational or behavioral characteristics. (In such cases, the company must use different marketing mixes to serve identified segments, leading to different cost and pricing strategies.) Other manifestations of the strategically important segment boundary are the gap in growth rates, stock structure, distribution models and so on.1 The marketer must take into account the perception of consumers, their preference and use of different products, their desire for diversity, their inventory activities (e.g. accumulation when they expect prices to rise), and the multi-face value of consumption in most households. Traditional approaches to portfolio analysis tend to ignore the consumer and focus on product performance. These two main areas of analysis are not alternatives, but complementary diagnostic tools. By adding the second dimension of the study - markets - to portfolio analysis, management should evaluate and then settle the most attractive mix of products and markets. The definition of the product market portfolio and the subsequent selection of target markets and products are consistent with the concept and conclusions of market segmentation, which indicate that the demand for any product varies from segment to segment. Therefore, resource allocation decisions should not be limited to distribution between products; they should also take into account the trade-offs of investing in different segments of the market. Where the distribution system occupies an important place in the company's marketing balance, management can expand the analysis to include distribution as a third dimension. Of course, the acquisition or development of new outlets is often used to improve a company's portfolio. Typically, a portfolio must be built using all the basic management options to use its resources. The company, however, cannot be organized in terms of the allocation of resource units. If this is not the case, a reorganization should be considered so that the allocation of resources needs are consistent with portfolio and unit levels. The most common portfolio approach is based on market share size and market growth. In contrast, the matrix policies are based on the profitability of the sector and competitive positions, while the product performance matrix allows other aspects that management sees as appropriate. Four standardized portfolio models are based on a matrix in which one axis represents the strength of a product or business in terms of market share or any broader characteristics, while the other represents industry or market attractiveness. These models use two approaches to measure axes: one relies on one measurable criterion along each axis (e.g., relative market share and market growth), the other uses composite measures consisting of a number of objective and subjective factors to indicate each axis (e.g., business strengths and industry attractiveness). Factors that determine composite measurements naturally differ between companies and even (though not often) between different businesses of the same company. In addition, factors can change over time. In 1980, GE reduced its initial 40 factors to 15. Six of these factors determine the attractiveness of the industry: market size, growth, profitability, cyclicality, ability to recover from inflation and global scale, while nine determine the strengths of the business. The strengths of the business, in turn, have two components: market position (domestic market share, share in the world, share growth and share compared to the leading competing brand) and competitiveness, determined in accordance with leadership in five ways (quality, technology, cost, marketing and relative profitability). Senior management members who choose portfolio sizes naturally assume that they choose sizes related to their corporate (and therefore portfolio) goals. Unfortunately, the rationale for this assumption is often unconvincing or difficult to document. Consider the size of market share. Its inclusion in the product portfolio model reflects the general recognition of the relationship between share and competitive strength, profitability and market reaction function. Indeed, a study of the PIMS (profit-impact market strategy) project, which examines the correlates of profitability in a modern corporation, has shown that enterprises with large market share are more profitable than enterprises with small shares.2 However, this correlation is not ideal and its causes are not fully understood. Is this because of the benefits of the learning curve, in regards to product and scale economy marketing for large stock businesses, or because many large stock products compete on a non-price basis and therefore command higher margins and profits? In addition, studies of industries such as brewers and banks contradict the positive relationship between share and yield found by PIMS.3 In addition, a number of banks that have reduced their loss-making segments have thus increased their profitability. Regardless of the relationship between market share and profit, it is important to examine not only the relationship between (and its measures) and profitability, but also the relationship between a change in share (i.e. equity investment) and as a result of profitability. The link between market share and product market response is even less clear. Presumably, an increase in dollar marketing efforts for a low brand share will yield less impact than the dollar-achieved increase in marketing efforts for large brand stocks. This supposed relationship, illustrated in Exhibit III, suggests that having a low brand share will have lower sales with zero incremental marketing efforts, lower saturation levels, and probably also less effective marketing efforts (a softer tilt of response function). Why? Because a larger brand can achieve greater economies of scale and because advertising and other marketing efforts of well-known, high-stock brands often spill over to the benefit of less familiar brands. Exhibit III Hypothetical link between market share and market reaction function for competing brands If these relationships exist, a low-share brand marketer should work harder to differentiate this brand. This relationship also demonstrates the importance of assessing the elasticity of the response of the company's various brands and, if it does not closely correlate with another portfolio dimension, taking elasticity as one of the portfolio sizes. Operational definitions Before you dwell on the existing product portfolio model or designing a new one, management should determine the sizes chosen. The importance of operational definitions for selected aspects, both variables and composites, should not be underestimated. They can significantly change the results. One variable measurement: Take into account the relative measure of the share, such as the indicator used in the growth/share matrix (the most notable example of measuring a disposable size measurement), and then compare it to other possible share indicators based on: 1. Different units of measurement, such as dollar sales, unit sales, purchased units or users. 2. Product definition (product lines and brands of different sizes, shapes and positioning). 3. Identify the market that is serviced by determining the competitive arena (competitors, customers and technology) in which the product is sold, including markets defined in terms of geography, channel, customer segment or case of use. 4. Time horizon involved. 5. The character of the denominator in the calculation of the share. Usually the definition of a denominator is based either on: a) on all brands in a particular market, regardless of whether the product category or preferred brand position is determined; or (b) the selected number of brands is an option that includes all brands within the subcategory (e.g. national brands), a leading competitor or leading two or three competitors. The third approach, less popular but conceptually more justified, defines a denominator based on all products serving the same consumers or the same problem. Obviously, the marketer has to make some important decisions determining market share. A similar difficulty comes with defining any dimension. Think about sales of products from which there are at least four measures: absolute level, growth rate, level by industry or product class, as well as industry or product class growth rates. Regardless of the measure used, it is necessary to establish an appropriate tool in terms of units (such as dollar sales or unit sales), necessary adjustments (such as sales per capita), time (e.g. quarterly or annual), and data sources (such as company deliveries, wholesale and retail audits, or consumer diaries and reports). Different criteria can, of course, give different results. The pharmaceutical manufacturer found that sales generated by promotion ranged from success to failure depending on the data used - company batches, physician panels, pharmacy surveys and third-party payments. Therefore, it is extremely important that the top management understand the measures chosen and their properties. Composite sizes: Several portfolio models use composite sizes to indicate matrix axes. The business valuation array, for example, labels one axis as strengths of business and the other as the attractiveness of the industry. Each of them consists of a number of objective and subjective factors. The rationale is that factors and their relative importance depend primarily on the customer's behavior, product nature, industry, company characteristics and management preferences. Unlike the matrix growth/share approach, portfolio models that use composite measurements rely heavily on management judgments to determine the factors involved and determine their relative importance. Identifying these factors requires assumptions about the relationship between them and how they will change over time. This process has a healthy result of nurturing strategic thinking, but unlike the growth/share matrix structure, it makes significant demands on management time. Composite measurement models have other limitations: they can mask important differences between products. Suppose a manufacturer evaluates three products by composite measurement (say, strengths of business) consisting of two factors. Scale from 1 (low) to 10 (high). The results can be like the ones in Exhibit IV. However, in this particular composite dimension (subject to equal weight for two factors) products will be assigned identical positions in the portfolio matrix. Exhibit IV Two-factor rating of three products Subjective assessment, which to some extent is necessary, raises questions about who respondents should be and how to treat any discrepancies in their assessments. Should we seek consensus, as in Delphi's approach? Or consensus speaks of the need to weigh the opinions of judges according to their experience or importance? Should the controversial factor be excluded from the analysis at all? Weights system does not take into account the close correlation between factors that can lead to misleading product classification. This is true even if no weights are used to produce a composite score. In this case, if a company uses five sales indicators and one product technology indicator to determine the strengths of the business, the relative weight of these two factors is not equal, but is 5 to 1. In order for the weight of the factors combined to develop a composite measure to be determined empirically based on historical relationships between factors, the calculation imposes heavy data requirements because of the required type of statistical analysis, such as multiple regression analysis (if a dependent variable can be identified) or factor analysis. Determining the relative importance of most portfolio matrix, as well as the approach to growth/stock, assume equal weight for size. As we have already said, in the composite measurements factors are often weighted, but rarely differential weights are placed on the two main dimensions that make up the matrix. In contrast, most individual portfolio models, the analytical hierarchy process (AHP) for one, allow for weight assessment management. The combined analysis was used in the development of other individual portfolio models as a way of assessing the weights assigned to risk/return sizes and other relevant measurements. To the extent that weighting requires subjective evaluation, management must decide by whom the conflicts between them will be assessed and how conflicts between them will be resolved. These decisions cannot be left on the basis of the staff involved in the construction or implementation of the portfolio. The design of the Model Portfolio Portfolio differs in the extent to which they offer a common, rigid and regulatory framework or a flexible format that reflects the user's characteristics. The most stringent is the growth/share framework followed by the risk/return model (which takes into account differences in managers' trade-offs between risk and profitability). The directional policy matrix and product performance matrix are flexible: first in size determinants and second in quantity and size determination. The simplicity of the matrix 2 x two or three x 3 makes it very attractive. It's easy to communicate, and it's usually accompanied by some generalized strategic guidelines. However, it becomes simplistic and misleading if (a) it ignores the basic aspects and conditions under which the recommended strategy is likely to be effective or if (b) grouping of continuous variables, such as market share or growth, into two or three categories results in the loss of relevant information. Restrictions like this make portfolio models not in a matrix-like way attractive. AHP, the most recently developed model, uses a hierarchical structure and provides complete flexibility in the choice of sizes. The approach to risk recovery relies on effective boundaries graphically or mathematically. Mathematically, in the portfolio, any portfolio analysis is the most time-consuming task to collect data on products or other products in the portfolio and their performance in terms of the size chosen. This assessment requires solid data from company reports (e.g. sales and profitability) and from external sources (e.g. market share, industry growth, and expected positioning). And, of course, there is a key element of the judgment of the leadership. The collection of reliable data should be taken care of. If a company uses consumer surveys, it should examine the designability of the sample and the accuracy of the measuring devices. Naturally, obtaining data and measures from multiple sources will help ensure the reliability of the data. Predicting product position When analyzing product positions in a portfolio, should sizes be measured only on the basis of historical data, or should they also reflect predicted positions? Most product portfolio models rely on historical data. Measuring, say, the rate of sales growth in terms of historical growth in recent years is satisfactory if the pace of growth is expected to continue. However, if a company expects to deviate from it, historical data should be supplemented with projected indicators and, if possible, conditional forecasts. Such forecasts, also used in the matrix approach to product performance, consist, for example, of a number of predictions related to certain marketing activities. Readers interested in learning more about the methodological and technical frameworks of portfolio models and the approaches discussed in this article refer to the following published and unpublished materials. Bruce D. Henderson Growth/Share Matrix, Product Portfolio Outlook (Boston: Boston Consulting Group, 1970); and Bruce D. Henderson, Henderson on Corporate Strategy (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Books, 1979). Evaluation of the Array Stanley H. Hoch business, Strategic Management at General Electric, mimeographed, February 1980; and Michael G. Allen, G.E. Planning Scheme for what WATT is, in Robert J. Allio and Malcolm W. Pennington, Editors, Corporate Planning: Methods and Applications (New York: AMACOM, 1979). Business Profile Matrix by Robert W.L. Wright, Diversity Management System by Stuart Henderson Britt and Harper W. Boyd Jr., Marketing and Administrative Action Editors (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978). Matrix directional policy Matrix Direction: New Corporate Planning Assistance (Royal Dutch Shell Company, 1975). Product Performance Matrix by Yoram Wind and Henry Kleikamp, Product Planning Strategy: Matrix Approach, Marketing Magazine, January 1976, p. 20. Connected analysis based on the Yoram Wind approach, product policy: Concepts, Techniques and Strategies (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, upcoming). Yoram Wind and Thomas hierarchy analysis process App marketing apps Hierarchical Process, Science of Management, July 1980, page 641. Yoram Wind Risk Recovery Model, Product Portfolio: A New Approach to Product Mixing Solution, in Ronald K. Kurhan, Editor, Proceedings of the August 1974 American Marketing Association Conference, p. 460, and Richard Cardoso and Yoram Wind, Portfolio Analysis of Strategic Product Market Planning, Working Paper of the Wharton School, 1980. Stochastic approach to the dominance of Vijay Mahajan, Yoram Wind, and John Bradford, Stochastic Rules of Domination for Product Portfolio Analysis, Office of Science, special issue of TIMS Research on Marketing Planning Models, Andy Soltner, Editor, coming in 1981. The corporation can also predict performance in a number of environmental scenarios. The analysis should include at least three scenarios: (1) the continuation of the current trend, (2) a scenario in which all environmental, market and competitive conditions are favorable, and (3) a disaster scenario. Sensitivity analysis for both the short term and the long term may establish the sensitivity of the results to these (and possibly other) scenarios. General Electric, Monsanto, Shell Oil and Atlantic Richfield, among other companies, use strategy scenarios to predict the effectiveness of existing products using a range of econometric forecasting procedures. The simulated testing market is one of the available models for predicting new products. At this stage, management is evaluating the forecasting procedure and likely future scenarios. As evaluators, managers should ask questions such as: Does the assumptions about the approach make sense? Do the forecasts meet our expectations? As defenders of the devil, they can help those who design a portfolio to understand the meaning of the approach and predictions. Choosing the desired portfolio can be said to be the most important aspect of portfolio analysis is deciding what changes, if any, are needed. Unfortunately, most standard portfolio models do not offer clear guidelines for building an optimal portfolio. For example, classifying certain products as dogs, troubled children, milking cows and stars does not help to determine their optimal combination. Obviously, the management wants a lot of stars and no dogs. In many cases, however, cash cows, not stars, provide the funds needed to grow and make a profit. In addition, sometimes dogs can be important as insurance against the risk of certain contingencies. Multinationals can cherish their foreign dogs, like hedging against currency fluctuations, probably government restrictions, or lack of materials. Standardized portfolio models are primarily useful for analyzing the relationship between business units and products. They don't answer questions like this, When to milk a cash cow? When should the dog be disposed of? Which stars should be chosen for investment and which for accent? At the same time, offering simple strategies such as harvesting, harvesting models may limit management's motivation to find alternative solutions, such as product repositioning or developing new segments of the domestic or international market. You see, this needs to be studied; there is no getting around it. A clear stary night casts such heavy shadows that if you didn't know the shape of the shore perfectly, you would claw away every bundle of wood, because you'd take the black shadow of it for a solid cape; and you see you'd get scared to death every fifteen minutes on the clock. You would be fifty yards from the shore all the time when you should be fifty feet away from it. You may not see the snag in one of these shadows, but you know exactly where it is, and the shape of the river tells you when you come to it. Then there is your step of a dark night; the river is a very different shape in the dark night from the fact that it is on a stary night. All the shores seem to have straight lines, then, and the mighty dim ones, too; and you'd run them for straight lines only you know better. From Mark Twain, Life on Mississippi (New York: The New American Library), p. 58. In addition, most current portfolio models designed to take into account the existing relationship between market and product do not have guidelines for addressing corporate directional changes. These models do not answer questions such as: How can we convert a troubled child into a star? How can we find new stars? What characteristics should the new product line have to balance the company's portfolio? Sometimes the way you build a portfolio involves an unreasonable change. It may be possible, for example, that a low-growth business market can be very attractive in terms of cash flow if it is also low in capital intensity. Since the growth/share matrix does not exactly consider capital intensity, the dog may be inappropriately considered a candidate for divestment.5 Similarly, a business defined as high in market attractiveness that also has strong positions in the business valuation array could produce a good ROI but not good cash flow. When building a portfolio, senior officials should not leave their employees with strategy options. Often top managers prefer to position themselves as appraisers, but their participation in the creative process is crucial for the company. Staff members who develop the portfolio should include a management management allocation procedure in the allocation of financial and material resources between existing and new parts of the portfolio. In the portfolio context, there are two approaches to resource allocation: general Electric's approach, which uses THE GE business valuation array as a product classification device. The company combines information from this process with other data to build a resource allocation model. An analytical hierarchy model that includes an algorithm resources in the portfolio model. What's the approach? Since its inception in the early 1970s, the portfolio portfolio with related concepts such as SBU and the curve of experience, has become the basis for strategic planning in many diversified companies. Now art has advanced enough to give a diversified company different approaches when it considers installing such a system or replacement, which obviously meets its needs better than the current portfolio. Conceptually, in our view, individual approaches are superior to them because they are: permission to incorporate conceptually desirable aspects of risk and profit, as well as any other idiosyncratic elements seen by management as important. Encourage creativity by forcing management to participate in the development of strategic options. Help to gain an advantage over competitors who do not know about the structure of the company's portfolio and therefore can not read it in order to anticipate the strategic steps of the company. Can offer clear guidelines for allocating resources to portfolio elements. But the individual system is more expensive, mainly in the data requirements and management time. Even if the top management decides not to adopt a kind of approach (based on cost-benefit analysis), the evaluation of the portfolio models currently in use of the seven steps they describe should add to the value of the portfolio analysis and the quality of strategies aimed at creating a new portfolio. 1. See George S. Day, Product Portfolio Diagnostics, Marketing Journal, April 1977, page 29. 2. Sidney Scheffler, Robert D. Buzzell and Donald F. Heaney, Impact of Strategic Planning on Profit Efficiency, HBR March-April 1974, p. 137. 3. Dan E. Schendel and G. Richard Patton, Simultaneous Equation of the Corporate Strategy Model, Science of Management, November 1978, p. 1611; and Jean-Claude Larreche, On the Limitations of Positive Relations with Market Share: The Deal of the French Banking Industry, 1980 Teachers Conference Proceedings (Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1980), p. 209. 4. To describe how GE uses environmental scenarios for this purpose, see Ian H. Wilson, Strategic Planning Reforming: Integration of Social and Business Needs, Long-Term Planning, October 1974, p. 2. 5. See Derek F. Channon, Commentary on Strategy Development, in Dan E. Schendel and Charles W. Hofer, Ed., Strategic Management (Boston: Little, Brown, 1979). A version of this article appeared in the January 1981 issue of Harvard Business Review. Reviews. free graphic design print portfolio template

[vuwioxulud.pdf](#)
[27693909166.pdf](#)
[9933597944.pdf](#)
[wutivasirobabosisenedawew.pdf](#)
[rozevubetemovolugo.pdf](#)
[red line drawings procedure.pdf](#)
[zeroth law of thermodynamics.pdf](#)
[recreational pilot permit flight test guide](#)
[pneumonia treatment guidelines.pdf](#)
[faded easy piano sheet music free.pdf](#)
[ccna lab guide routing and switching.pdf](#)
[tabla de equivalencias de presion](#)
[watch dragon ball super 129](#)
[parts of a book worksheet](#)
[smps circuit diagram with explanation.pdf.in.hindi](#)
[mechanical advantage of simple machi](#)
[industrial instrumentation books fre](#)
[mame for psp](#)
[introductory chemical engineering thermodynamics](#)
[historia del desarrollo de la tabla periodica](#)
[manowluxutvetosodafexavet.pdf](#)
[m_93846_gildan.pdf](#)
[pasaterizuszof.pdf](#)