

PERKINELMER INC
Form DEF 14A
March 14, 2018
Table of Contents

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

SCHEDULE 14A

(Rule 14a-101)

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN PROXY STATEMENT

SCHEDULE 14A INFORMATION

Proxy Statement Pursuant to Section 14(a) of the

Securities Exchange Act of 1934

Filed by the Registrant

Filed by a party other than the Registrant

Check the appropriate box:

Preliminary Proxy Statement

Confidential, for Use of the Commission Only (as permitted by Rule 14a-6(e)(2))

Definitive Proxy Statement

Definitive Additional Materials

Soliciting Material Pursuant to §240.14a-12

PerkinElmer, Inc.

(Name of Registrant as Specified In Its Charter)

Not applicable.

(Name of Person(s) Filing Proxy Statement, if other than the Registrant)

Payment of Filing Fee (Check the appropriate box):

No fee required.

Fee computed on table below per Exchange Act Rules 14a-6(i)(1) and 0-11.

- (1) Title of each class of securities to which transaction applies:

- (2) Aggregate number of securities to which transaction applies:

- (3) Per unit price or other underlying value of transaction computed pursuant to Exchange Act Rule 0-11 (set forth the amount on which the filing fee is calculated and state how it was determined):

- (4) Proposed maximum aggregate value of transaction:

- (5) Total fee paid:

Fee paid previously with preliminary materials.

Check box if any part of the fee is offset as provided by Exchange Act Rule 0-11(a)(2) and identify the filing for which the offsetting fee was paid previously. Identify the previous filing by registration statement number, or the Form or Schedule and the date of its filing.

- (1) Amount previously paid:

- (2) Form, Schedule or Registration Statement No.:

- (3) Filing party:

- (4) Date Filed:

Table of Contents

March 14, 2018

Dear Shareholder:

We cordially invite you to attend the 2018 annual meeting of shareholders of PerkinElmer, Inc. to be held on Tuesday, April 24, 2018, at 8:00 a.m. at our corporate offices at 940 Winter Street, Waltham, Massachusetts.

The attached notice of annual meeting and proxy statement contain information about matters to be considered at the annual meeting, and a map with directions to the meeting is on the back cover of the proxy statement. Only shareholders and their proxies are invited to attend the annual meeting.

Your vote is important regardless of the number of shares you own. Whether or not you plan to attend the meeting, I hope you will review carefully the attached proxy materials and vote as soon as possible. We urge you to complete, sign and return the enclosed proxy card or to vote over the Internet or by telephone, so that your shares will be represented and voted at the annual meeting.

Thank you for your continued support of PerkinElmer.

Sincerely,
ROBERT F. FRIEL
*Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and
President*

Table of Contents

Notice of Annual Meeting

and

Proxy Statement 2018

PerkinElmer, Inc.

Corporate Offices

940 Winter Street

Waltham, Massachusetts 02451

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<u>NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING</u>	
<u>OVERVIEW</u>	i
<u>PROXY STATEMENT</u>	1
<u>General Information</u>	1
<u>Householding of Annual Meeting Materials</u>	2
<u>Proposals</u>	3
<u>Votes Required</u>	3
<u>PROPOSAL NO. 1 ELECTION OF DIRECTORS</u>	5
<u>INFORMATION RELATING TO OUR BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND ITS COMMITTEES</u>	11
<u>Determination of Independence</u>	11
<u>Director Candidates</u>	11
<u>Criteria and Diversity</u>	12
<u>Leadership Structure</u>	12
<u>Communications from Shareholders and Other Interested Parties</u>	13
<u>Board of Directors Role in Risk Oversight</u>	13
<u>Board of Directors Meetings and Committees</u>	13
<u>Compensation Committee Interlocks and Insider Participation</u>	15
<u>Report of the Audit Committee</u>	15
<u>Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm Fees and Other Matters</u>	16
<u>Certain Relationships and Policies on Related Party Transactions</u>	17
<u>DIRECTOR COMPENSATION</u>	19
<u>BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP OF COMMON STOCK</u>	23
<u>EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION</u>	25
<u>Compensation Discussion and Analysis</u>	25
<u>Compensation Committee Report</u>	48
<u>Summary Compensation Table</u>	49
<u>2017 Grants of Plan-Based Awards</u>	51
<u>Outstanding Equity Awards at 2017 Fiscal Year-End</u>	53
<u>Option Exercises and Stock Vested in Fiscal 2017</u>	55
<u>2017 Pension Benefits</u>	56
<u>2017 Non-Qualified Deferred Compensation</u>	58
<u>Potential Payments upon Termination or Change in Control</u>	59
<u>Equity Compensation Plan Information</u>	72
<u>CEO Pay Ratio</u>	73
<u>PROPOSAL NO. 2 RATIFICATION OF SELECTION OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM</u>	74
<u>PROPOSAL NO. 3 NON-BINDING ADVISORY VOTE ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION</u>	75

<u>OTHER MATTERS</u>	76
<u>SECTION 16(a) BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP REPORTING COMPLIANCE</u>	76
<u>SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS FOR 2019 ANNUAL MEETING OF SHAREHOLDERS</u>	76
<u>APPENDIX A RECONCILIATION OF GAAP TO NON-GAAP FINANCIAL MEASURES</u>	A-1
<u>APPENDIX B FORM OF PROXY CARD</u>	B-1

Table of Contents

NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING

To the Shareholders of PerkinElmer, Inc.:

The annual meeting of the shareholders of PerkinElmer, Inc. will be held at the company's corporate offices, located at 940 Winter Street, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451, on Tuesday, April 24, 2018, at 8:00 a.m., to consider and act upon the following:

1. A proposal to elect nine nominees for director for terms of one year each;
2. A proposal to ratify the selection of Deloitte & Touche LLP as PerkinElmer's independent registered public accounting firm for the current fiscal year;
3. A proposal to approve, by non-binding advisory vote, our executive compensation; and
4. Such other matters as may properly come before the meeting or any adjournment or postponement thereof.

Our board of directors has no knowledge of any other business to be transacted at the meeting.

Our board of directors has fixed the close of business on February 26, 2018 as the record date for the determination of shareholders entitled to receive this notice and to vote at the meeting.

All shareholders are cordially invited to attend the meeting.

By Order of the Board of Directors,

ROBERT F. FRIEL
*Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and
President*

March 14, 2018

RETURN ENCLOSED PROXY CARD OR VOTE BY INTERNET OR TELEPHONE

Whether or not you expect to attend this meeting, please complete, date, and sign the enclosed proxy card and mail it promptly in the enclosed envelope. No postage is required if mailed in the United States. Prompt response is important and your cooperation will be appreciated. If the envelope is lost, please return the card to Vote Processing, c/o Broadridge, 51 Mercedes Way, Edgewood, New York 11717. Alternatively, you may submit your vote via the Internet or telephone by following the instructions set forth on the enclosed proxy card.

Table of Contents**OVERVIEW**

To assist you in reviewing the proxy statement for the PerkinElmer, Inc. 2018 annual meeting of shareholders, we call your attention to the following information about the annual meeting, our corporate governance framework and key facts regarding our executive compensation structure and practices. For more complete information, please review the PerkinElmer, Inc. proxy statement in its entirety, as well as our annual report to shareholders for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017.

Annual Meeting of Shareholders

Date and Time:	April 24, 2018 at 8:00 a.m. (Eastern Time)
Place:	PerkinElmer, Inc. corporate offices at 940 Winter Street, Waltham, MA 02451
Record Date:	February 26, 2018
Voting:	If you are a record holder of shares as of the record date, you may vote your shares. You may vote either in person at the annual meeting, or by the Internet, telephone or mail. If you are the beneficial owner of shares held in street name as of the record date, you will need to instruct the record holder of your shares how you would like the shares to be voted. See the section of the proxy statement titled General Information for more detail regarding how you may vote your shares.
Admission:	You are entitled to attend the annual meeting if you were a shareholder as of the record date. If your shares are held in street name, you must bring an account statement or letter from the record holder of your shares showing that you are the beneficial owner of the shares as of the record date in order to be admitted to the annual meeting.

Meeting Agenda and Voting Recommendations

	Board	
Agenda Items	Recommendation	Page
(1) Election of nine directors for terms of one year each.	FOR EACH DIRECTOR NOMINEE	5
(2) Ratification of selection of Deloitte & Touche LLP as our independent registered public accounting firm for fiscal 2018.	FOR	74
(3) To approve, by non-binding advisory vote, our executive compensation.	FOR	75

Table of Contents**Director Nominees**

The following table provides summary information about the nine directors nominated for election as directors for terms of one year each:

Name	Director		Principal Occupation	Current Committee	
	Age	Since		Memberships	Independent?
Peter Barrett	65	2012	Partner, Atlas Venture	Compensation & Benefits; Nominating & Corporate Governance	Yes
Samuel R. Chapin	60	2016	Retired Executive Vice Chairman, Bank of America Merrill Lynch	Audit (Chair); Finance	Yes
Robert F. Friel	62	2006	Chairman, CEO and President of PerkinElmer	Finance	No
Sylvie Grégoire, PharmD	56	2015	Advisor to biotechnology companies	Compensation & Benefits; Nominating & Corporate Governance	Yes
Nicholas A. Lopardo	71	1996	Chairman and CEO of NAL Group	Finance (Chair); Audit	Yes
Alexis P. Michas	60	2001	Managing Partner of Juniper Investment Company, LLC	Lead Director; Nominating & Corporate Governance (Chair); Finance	Yes
Patrick J. Sullivan	66	2008	Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of Insulet Corporation	Compensation & Benefits (Chair); Audit	Yes
Frank Witney, PhD	64	2016	Former Chief Executive Officer, Affymetrix, Inc.	Audit; Compensation & Benefits	Yes
Pascale Witz	51	2017	Founder and CEO of PWH Advisors		Yes

Corporate Governance Highlights

The following table summarizes our board structure and key elements of our corporate governance framework:

Size of Board	Nine
Number of Independent Directors	Eight
Chairman & CEO	Combined
Lead Independent Director	Yes
Board Self-Evaluation	Annual
Review of Independence of Board	Annual
Independent Directors Meet Without Management Present	Yes

Structure of Board	Non-Classified
Voting Standard for Election of Directors in Uncontested Elections	Majority of Shares Cast
Diversity (as to background, experience and skills)	Yes
Corporate Governance Guidelines	Yes

ii [PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement](#)

Table of Contents***Fiscal 2017 Compensation Highlights***

2017 Compensation Structure. The structure of our executive compensation program supports our business strategy by driving top-line results while remaining focused on profitability and increased operating productivity, and by creating sustainable market positions for our products, technology and services. This is evidenced by the significant percentage of our executive compensation package tied to short- or long-term performance. Not including the cost of benefits, in 2017 our Chief Executive Officer had 86% of his target compensation at risk, and on average our other named executive officers had 74% of their target compensation at risk (that is, subject to either performance requirements and/or service requirements).

2017 Target Total Compensation

We believe the combination of strong top- and bottom-line financial performance and a solid balance sheet creates growth in shareholder value that is sustainable over the long term.

Compensation Best Practices. We employ the following policies and practices that are designed to ensure our executive compensation programs are well-governed, reflect market-based best practices and do not promote inappropriate risk taking:

Independent Compensation and Benefits Committee	Yes
Independent Compensation Advisor	Yes
Stock Ownership Guidelines	Yes
Elimination of Section 280G Excise Tax Gross-Ups (new agreements after July 2010)	Yes
Elimination of Single-Trigger Equity Vesting (new agreements after February 2010)	Yes
No Stock Option Repricing without Shareholder Approval	Yes
Recoupment Provision in Short-Term Incentive Plan	Yes
Anti-Hedging and Anti-Pledging Rules	Yes
Compensation Risk Assessment	Annual
Shareholder Vote to Approve Executive Compensation on an Advisory Basis	Annual

Overall, we have a strong pay-for-performance culture and have implemented compensation programs and practices creating alignment with the interests of our shareholders. Further information regarding our executive compensation programs is found in the proxy statement under **Compensation Discussion and Analysis** beginning on page 25.

Table of Contents

PROXY STATEMENT

General Information

PerkinElmer, Inc., also referred to as we, us, the Company or PerkinElmer, has prepared this proxy statement to provide our shareholders with information pertaining to the matters to be voted on at our annual meeting of shareholders to be held on Tuesday, April 24, 2018 at 8:00 a.m., at our corporate offices, located at 940 Winter Street, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451, and at any adjournment of that meeting. The date of this proxy statement is March 14, 2018, the approximate date on which we first sent or provided the proxy statement and form of proxy to our shareholders.

Our board of directors has fixed the close of business on February 26, 2018 as the record date for determining the shareholders entitled to receive notice of, and to vote their shares at, the meeting. On the record date, there were 110,504,347 shares of our common stock outstanding and entitled to vote. Each share of common stock carries the right to cast one vote on each of the proposals presented for shareholder action, with no cumulative voting.

Your vote is important no matter how many shares you own. Please take the time to vote. Take a moment to read the instructions below. Choose the way to vote that is easiest and most convenient for you, and cast your vote as soon as possible.

If you are the record holder of your shares, meaning that you own your shares in your own name and not through a bank or brokerage firm, you may vote in one of four ways:

- (1) *You may vote over the Internet.* If you have Internet access, you may vote your shares from any location in the world by following the **Vote by Internet** instructions on the enclosed proxy card.
- (2) *You may vote by telephone.* You may vote your shares by following the **Vote by Telephone** instructions on the enclosed proxy card.
- (3) *You may vote by mail.* You may vote by completing and signing the proxy card delivered with this proxy statement and promptly mailing it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. The shares you own will be voted according to your instructions on the proxy card you mail. If you sign and return the proxy card, but do not give any instructions on a particular matter described in this proxy statement, the shares you own will be voted in accordance with the recommendations of our board of directors. The board of directors recommends that you vote FOR Proposal No. 1 to elect nine nominees for director for terms of one year each, FOR Proposal No. 2 to ratify the selection of Deloitte & Touche LLP as PerkinElmer's independent registered public accounting firm for the current fiscal year, and FOR Proposal No. 3 to approve, on a non-binding advisory basis, our executive compensation.
- (4) *You may vote in person.* If you attend the meeting, you may vote by delivering your completed proxy card in person or you may vote by completing a ballot. Ballots will be available at the meeting.

You can change your vote and revoke your proxy at any time before the polls close at the meeting by doing any one of the following:

signing another proxy card and either arranging for delivery of that proxy card by mail prior to the start of the meeting, or by delivering that signed proxy card in person at the meeting;

giving our Secretary a written notice before or at the meeting that you want to revoke your proxy; or

voting in person at the meeting.

Your attendance at the meeting alone will not revoke your proxy.

Note that if voting by Internet or telephone, you may change your vote and revoke your proxy up until 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time the day before the meeting by following the [Vote by Internet](#) or [Vote by Telephone](#) instructions, respectively, on the enclosed proxy card.

Table of Contents

If the shares you own are held in street name by a bank, broker or other nominee record holder, which, for convenience, we collectively refer to in this proxy statement as brokerage firms, your brokerage firm, as the record holder of your shares, is required to vote your shares according to your instructions. In order to vote your shares, you will need to follow the directions your brokerage firm provides you. Many brokerage firms also offer the option of providing for voting over the Internet or by telephone, instructions for which, if available, would be provided by your brokerage firm on the vote instruction form that it delivers to you. Under the current rules of the New York Stock Exchange, or NYSE, if you do not give instructions to your brokerage firm, it will still be able to vote your shares with respect to certain discretionary items, but will not be allowed to vote your shares with respect to certain non-discretionary items. The ratification of Deloitte & Touche LLP as our independent registered public accounting firm (Proposal No. 2) is considered to be a discretionary item under the NYSE rules, and your brokerage firm will be able to vote on that item even if it does not receive instructions from you, as long as it holds your shares in its name. The election of directors (Proposal No. 1) and the approval of our executive compensation program (Proposal No. 3) are both non-discretionary items. If you return an instruction card to your brokerage firm but do not instruct your brokerage firm on how to vote with respect to these items, your brokerage firm will not vote with respect to the proposal(s) for which you did not give instructions, and your shares will be counted as broker non-votes with respect to those proposals. Broker non-votes are shares that are held in street name by a brokerage firm that indicates on its proxy that it does not have or did not exercise discretionary authority to vote on a particular matter.

If your shares are held in street name, you must bring an account statement or letter from your brokerage firm showing that you are the beneficial owner of the shares as of the record date (February 26, 2018) in order to be admitted to the meeting on April 24, 2018. To be able to vote your shares held in street name at the meeting, you will need to obtain a proxy card from the holder of record.

This proxy is solicited on behalf of our board of directors. We will bear the expenses connected with this proxy solicitation. We expect to pay brokers, nominees, fiduciaries, and other custodians their reasonable expenses for forwarding proxy materials and annual reports to principals and obtaining their voting instructions. We have engaged Georgeson Inc. of New York, New York to assist us in soliciting proxies from brokers, nominees, fiduciaries, and custodians, and will pay Georgeson \$25,000 plus out-of-pocket expenses for its efforts. In addition to the use of the mails, our directors, officers, and employees may, without additional remuneration, solicit proxies in person or by use of other communications media.

We previously mailed to shareholders, or are providing with this proxy statement, our annual report to shareholders for 2017. The annual report is not part of, or incorporated by reference in, this proxy statement.

Important Notice Regarding the Availability of Proxy Materials for

the Annual Meeting of Shareholders to Be Held on April 24, 2018:

This proxy statement and the 2017 annual report to shareholders are available at

www.proxyvote.com for viewing, downloading and printing.

A copy of our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017 as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, except for exhibits, will be furnished without charge to any shareholder upon written or oral request to PerkinElmer, Inc., 940 Winter Street, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451, Attention: Investor Relations, Telephone: (800) 762-4000.

Householding of Annual Meeting Materials

Some brokerage firms may be participating in the practice of householding proxy statements, annual reports and notices of Internet availability of proxy materials. This means that only one copy of these documents may have been sent to multiple shareholders in your household. We will promptly

[2 PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement](#)

Table of Contents

deliver a separate copy of any of these documents to you if you request one by writing or calling as follows: PerkinElmer, Inc., 940 Winter Street, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451, Attention: Investor Relations, Telephone: (800) 762-4000. If you want to receive separate copies of our annual report and proxy statement in the future, or if you are receiving multiple copies and would like to receive only one copy for your household, you should contact your brokerage firm, or you may contact us at the above address and phone number.

Proposals

The proposals being presented for shareholder action are set forth on your proxy card and are discussed in detail on the following pages. Shares that you have the power to vote that are represented by proxy will be voted at the meeting in accordance with your instructions indicated on the enclosed proxy card or submitted by Internet or telephone.

The first proposal is to elect nine directors for terms of one year each. You may vote for or against each nominee, or may abstain from voting on any nominee, by marking the appropriate box on the proxy card, or submitting instructions by Internet or telephone. If you return a proxy card, or submit instructions by Internet or telephone, your shares will be voted as you indicate. **If you sign and return your proxy card or submit instructions by Internet or telephone and make no indication concerning one or more of the nominees, your shares will be voted FOR electing those nominees for whom you made no indication.**

The second proposal is to ratify the selection of Deloitte & Touche LLP as our independent registered public accounting firm for the current fiscal year ending December 30, 2018. You may vote for or against this proposal or abstain from voting on this proposal by marking the appropriate box on the proxy card or submitting instructions by Internet or telephone. If you return a proxy card or submit instructions by Internet or telephone, your shares will be voted as you indicate. **If you sign and return your proxy card or submit instructions by Internet or telephone and make no indication concerning this proposal, your shares will be voted FOR the second proposal.**

The third proposal is to approve, by non-binding advisory vote, our executive compensation. You may vote for or against this proposal or abstain from voting on this proposal by marking the appropriate box on the proxy card or submitting instructions by Internet or telephone. If you return a proxy card or submit instructions by Internet or telephone, your shares will be voted as you indicate. **If you sign and return your proxy card or submit instructions by Internet or telephone and make no indication concerning this proposal, your shares will be voted FOR the third proposal.**

Our management does not anticipate a vote on any other proposal at the meeting. Under Massachusetts law, where we are incorporated, only matters included in the notice of the meeting may be brought before our shareholders at a meeting. If, however, another proposal is properly brought before the meeting, your shares will be voted in accordance with the discretion of the named proxies.

Votes Required

A majority in interest of all PerkinElmer common stock issued, outstanding and entitled to vote on each proposal being submitted for shareholder action at the meeting constitutes a quorum with respect to that proposal. Shares of common stock represented by executed proxies received by us will be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum, regardless of how or whether those shares are voted on the proposal. Therefore, abstentions and broker non-votes are counted for purposes of determining whether a quorum exists at the meeting for that proposal.

For a nominee to be elected as a director pursuant to Proposal No. 1, more votes must be cast for such nominee's election than against such nominee's election. For the ratification of our independent registered public accounting firm

pursuant to Proposal No. 2, the majority of the votes cast on

Table of Contents

Proposal No. 2 must be cast for the ratification. For the approval, by non-binding vote, of our executive compensation program pursuant to Proposal No. 3, the majority of the votes cast on Proposal No. 3 must be cast in favor of the executive compensation program. Shares abstaining and broker non-votes, if any, will not be counted as votes for or against, and as a result will have no effect on voting on these proposals, other than for purposes of establishing a quorum.

Although the advisory vote on Proposal No. 3 is non-binding, as provided by law, our board values shareholders opinions and will take the results of the vote into account when considering any changes to our executive compensation program.

4 [PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement](#)

Table of Contents

PROPOSAL NO. 1 ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

Our charter and By-laws provide that the shareholders or the board of directors will determine the number of directors to serve on our board as not fewer than three nor more than thirteen. Our nominees for directors are each elected for a one-year term at the annual meeting of shareholders in accordance with our charter and By-laws. We currently have nine directors, all of whose terms expire at this meeting.

Our board of directors, upon the recommendation of its nominating and corporate governance committee, has nominated the following persons for election as directors for one-year terms, each expiring at the annual meeting of shareholders to be held in 2019. All of the nominees are currently directors of PerkinElmer and, except for Ms. Witz, were elected by our shareholders at the 2017 annual meeting. Our board of directors elected Ms. Witz to serve as a director in October 2017.

Peter Barrett
Samuel R. Chapin
Robert F. Friel
Sylvie Grégoire, PharmD
Nicholas A. Lopardo

Alexis P. Michas
Patrick J. Sullivan
Frank Witney, PhD
Pascale Witz

PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement 5

Table of Contents

OUR BOARD OF DIRECTORS RECOMMENDS THAT YOU VOTE FOR

ELECTING EACH OF THE NINE NOMINEES NAMED ABOVE FOR TERMS OF ONE YEAR EACH.

The persons named as proxies on the proxy card will vote shares represented by a proxy for the election of the nine nominees for terms of one year each, unless the shareholder instructs otherwise on their proxy card. Our board of directors knows of no reason why any nominee should be unable or unwilling to serve. However, if that becomes the case, the persons named as proxies on the proxy card may vote to elect a substitute. In no event will shares represented by proxies be voted for more than nine nominees.

To apprise you of their qualifications to serve as directors, we include the following information concerning each of the director nominees. The qualifications presented include information each nominee has provided to us regarding age, current positions held, principal occupation and business experience for the past five years, as well as the names of other publicly held companies of which the nominee currently serves as a director or has served as a director during the past five years. In addition to the information presented regarding each nominee's specific experience, qualifications, attributes and skills that led the nominating and corporate governance committee to recommend that our board nominate these individuals, our board believes that all of the nominees have a reputation for honesty, integrity and adherence to high ethical standards. The nominating and corporate governance committee also believes that the nominees possess the willingness to engage management and each other in a positive and collaborative fashion, and are prepared to make the significant commitment of time and energy to serve on our board and its committees.

PETER BARRETT: *Age 65; Principal Occupation: Partner, Atlas Venture, a venture capital fund based in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Director of PerkinElmer since 2012. Member of the compensation and benefits and nominating and corporate governance committees.*

Mr. Barrett joined Atlas Venture, an early stage life sciences venture capital fund, in 2002 and is a partner in the life sciences group. Previously, he was a co-founder, Executive Vice President and Chief Business Officer of Celera Genomics. Prior to that, Mr. Barrett held several senior management positions at The Perkin-Elmer Corporation, most recently serving as Vice President, Corporate Planning and Business Development. He currently serves as the Chairman of Zafgen, Inc. and Synlogic, Inc., as well as a board member of several privately held companies, and during the past five years has served as a director of Akela Pharma, Inc., Alnylam Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Helicos BioSciences Corporation, Momenta Pharmaceuticals, Inc., SciClone Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Vitae Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Mr. Barrett is also a senior fellow at the Harvard Business School. Mr. Barrett received his Bachelor of Science degree in chemistry from Lowell Technological Institute (now known as the University of Massachusetts, Lowell) and his Doctoral degree in analytical chemistry from Northeastern University.

Mr. Barrett brings to the board three decades of experience in the life sciences industry, including leadership positions both as a senior executive and as an institutional investor. These roles have allowed him to develop expertise in the deployment of strategic growth initiatives within the industry. His service on the boards of other companies, both publicly and privately held, enables him to assist our board in the performance of its governance obligations.

SAMUEL R. CHAPIN: *Age 60; Principal Occupation: Retired Executive Vice Chairman, Bank of America Merrill Lynch, a worldwide financial institution. Director of PerkinElmer since 2016. Chair of the audit committee and member of the finance committee.*

Mr. Chapin was appointed Executive Vice Chairman of Global Corporate & Investment Banking at Bank of America Merrill Lynch in February 2010, where he was responsible for managing relationships with some of the firm's largest

clients. Mr. Chapin retired from the firm as of June 30, 2016. Mr. Chapin has worked on a broad range of financings and strategic advisory assignments totaling more than \$500 billion, and has been named Investment Banker of the Year by *Investment Dealers Digest*. Mr. Chapin was named Vice Chairman of Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. in September 2003 and was a member of the firm's executive Operating Committee. From 2001 to 2003, he was Senior Vice

6 [PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement](#)

Table of Contents

President and Head of the Global Investment Banking division. Mr. Chapin first joined Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. in 1984 as a member of the Mergers & Acquisitions group and was named a Managing Director in Corporate Banking in 1993, eventually leading the group within investment banking that provided coverage for industrial companies and actively managing the firm's relationships with industrial and consumer products companies. Mr. Chapin is a member of the board of directors of the Roundabout Theatre Company, serves on the board of trustees at Lafayette College and is a director for the Wharton Financial Advisory Board. Mr. Chapin holds a Bachelor of Arts degree from Lafayette College and a Master of Business Administration degree from The Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chapin provides our board expertise in corporate finance and strategy, including experience gained as a senior executive at a global financial services firm. He also brings to our board extensive knowledge of the industrial marketplace, along with deep experience in transactional processes, mergers and acquisitions, and deal financing for a wide range of transactions.

ROBERT F. FRIEL: *Age 62; Principal Occupation: Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and President of PerkinElmer. Director of PerkinElmer since 2006. Member of the finance committee.*

Mr. Friel currently serves as Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and President of PerkinElmer. Prior to being appointed President and Chief Executive Officer in February 2008 and Chairman in April 2009, he had served as President and Chief Operating Officer since August 2007, and as Vice Chairman and President of our Life and Analytical Sciences unit since January 2006. Mr. Friel was our Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, with responsibility for business development and information technology in addition to his oversight of our finance functions, from October 2004 until January 2006. Mr. Friel joined PerkinElmer in February 1999 as our Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer. Prior to joining PerkinElmer, he held several senior management positions with AlliedSignal, Inc., now Honeywell International. Mr. Friel received a Bachelor of Arts degree in economics from Lafayette College and a Master of Science degree in taxation from Fairleigh Dickinson University. Mr. Friel is currently a director of NuVasive, Inc. and Xylem Inc., and during the past five years has served as a director of CareFusion Corporation. He also previously served on the national board of trustees for the March of Dimes Foundation.

Mr. Friel has been one of the primary architects of PerkinElmer's transformation into a global technology leader focused on improving the health and safety of people and the environment. Mr. Friel's almost twenty years of executive experience with PerkinElmer has allowed him to develop a broad knowledge of our operations and activities, and that operational and leadership experience has been essential in formulating appropriate business strategies. His current and past service on the boards of other public companies has provided him with additional insights about service as the Chairman of our board.

SYLVIE GRÉGOIRE, PharmD: *Age 56; Principal Occupation: Advisor to biotechnology companies. Director of PerkinElmer since 2015. Member of the compensation and benefits and nominating and corporate governance committees.*

Dr. Grégoire served as President of the Human Genetic Therapies division of Shire plc, a public biopharmaceutical company, from 2007 to 2013, and from 2005 to 2008 she served as a director of IDM Pharma, Inc., a public biotechnology company that now operates as a subsidiary of Takeda Pharmaceuticals, including serving as its Executive Chair from August 2006 to October 2007. From 2004 to 2005, Dr. Grégoire served as President, Chief Executive Officer and Executive Member of the board of directors of GlycoFi, Inc., a private biotechnology company. Prior to that, Dr. Grégoire was employed in several key operating and regulatory affairs positions at Biogen, Inc. (now known as Biogen Idec Inc.) and Merck & Co. Dr. Grégoire currently serves on the board of Vifor Pharma Ltd. (formerly Galenica Group) and Novo Nordisk A/S, as well as several privately held companies. Dr. Grégoire holds a

Pharmacy degree from Laval University and a Doctoral degree from the State University of New York at Buffalo.

Table of Contents

Dr. Grégoire provides the board with a depth of experience in the management of commercial operations, manufacturing and regulatory affairs within the biotechnology industry, both domestically and internationally. Her extensive background gained over the course of almost thirty years of leadership positions with both public and private companies, as well as her current and past service on the boards of other public companies, will provide the board with valuable guidance in overseeing the strategic direction of the Company.

NICHOLAS A. LOPARDO: *Age 71; Principal Occupation: Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of NAL Group, an investment holding company based in Swampscott, Massachusetts. Director of PerkinElmer since 1996. Chair of the finance committee and member of the audit committee.*

Mr. Lopardo has been Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of NAL Group, an investment holding company formerly known as Susquehanna Capital Management Group, since January 2002. Mr. Lopardo retired in December 2001 as Vice Chairman of State Street Bank and Trust Company and Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of State Street Global Advisors, the bank's investment management group. Mr. Lopardo had been associated with State Street Bank and Trust Company since 1987, and previously held several executive level positions including Executive Vice President. Mr. Lopardo has almost forty years of experience in the pension industry, having served in a variety of roles with Equitable Life Assurance Society related to pension marketing, client relationships, and pension investment advisory services. Mr. Lopardo also serves as a director of several privately held companies. He served eight years as a member of the board of directors of Susquehanna University, holding the position of Chairman of that board in 2000 and 2001. He was also Chairman of the advisory board of the Weiss School of Business at Susquehanna University, and is Chairman Emeritus of the board and a lifetime trustee of the Landmark School, a premier secondary school for students with language-based learning disabilities. Mr. Lopardo is also a board member of Boston Partners in Education and USA Hockey Foundation. Mr. Lopardo received a Bachelor of Science degree in marketing and management from Susquehanna University.

Mr. Lopardo has spent more than four decades working in positions of executive leadership within the financial services industry. His demonstrated acumen for business leadership on an international scale enables him to provide expert oversight of our senior management team in his roles as a member of our board and as a member of the audit committee of our board. Additionally, Mr. Lopardo utilizes the skill and experience that he has developed in corporate financial matters as Chair of the finance committee of our board.

ALEXIS P. MICHAS: *Age 60; Principal Occupation: Managing Partner of Juniper Investment Company, LLC, an investment management firm based in New York. Director of PerkinElmer since 2001. Lead Director, Chair of the nominating and corporate governance committee and member of the finance committee.*

Mr. Michas is the founder and has been Managing Partner of Juniper Investment Company, LLC since 2008. Juniper is also a Principal of Aetolian Investors, LLC, a registered commodity pool operator. Mr. Michas was the Managing Partner and a director of Stonington Partners, Inc., an investment management firm, from 1994 to 2011. Mr. Michas received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Harvard College and a Master of Business Administration degree from Harvard Business School. Mr. Michas is the Non-Executive Chairman of the board of BorgWarner Inc. and is also on the board of privately held Theragenics Corporation. Mr. Michas also served as a director of AirTran Airways, Inc. until its acquisition by Southwest Airlines in 2011, as the Non-Executive Chairman of the board of Lincoln Educational Services Corporation until 2015, and as a director of Allied Motion Technologies, Inc. until July 2017.

Mr. Michas brings to our board many years of private equity experience across a wide range of industries, and a successful record of managing investments in public companies. Mr. Michas also brings extensive transactional expertise, including mergers and acquisitions, IPOs, debt and equity offerings, and bank financing. This expertise is utilized through his position as a member of the finance committee of our board, allowing Mr. Michas to provide our

board with valuable insight on

8 [PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement](#)

Table of Contents

trends in global debt and equity markets, and the impact of such trends on the capital structure of the Company. We also benefit from the corporate governance knowledge developed by Mr. Michas in his board roles with other public companies, including his service as a lead director, a board chairman, and a member of the compensation, governance, audit, finance and executive committees of such companies. Mr. Michas' knowledge of the Company and his thorough understanding of the role of boards of directors qualify him to serve on our board and as our Lead Director.

PATRICK J. SULLIVAN: *Age 66; Principal Occupation: Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of Insulet Corporation, an innovative medical device company based in Billerica, Massachusetts. Director of PerkinElmer since 2008. Chair of the compensation and benefits committee and member of the audit committee.*

Mr. Sullivan has served as the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board of Insulet Corporation, a publicly traded medical device company, since October 2016, having previously served as President, Chief Executive Officer and Director since September 2014. Prior to that, Mr. Sullivan was the Executive Chairman and a director of Hologic from its merger with Cytoc Corporation in October 2007 until May 2008. Mr. Sullivan previously served Cytoc as Chief Executive Officer and a director since March 1994, Vice Chairman of the board of directors since January 2001, Chairman-elect since January 2002 and Chairman since May 2002. From March 1994 to January 2002, and from July 2002 to October 2007, Mr. Sullivan also served as President of Cytoc, and from January 1991 to March 1994, as Vice President of Sales and Marketing. Prior to joining Cytoc, Mr. Sullivan was employed in key senior marketing positions for five years by Abbott Laboratories, a diversified healthcare company, and was a consultant with McKinsey & Company, an international management consulting firm. In addition to serving as a director of Insulet Corporation, Mr. Sullivan currently serves on the board of several privately held companies and was a member of the board of directors of Gen-Probe Incorporated until its acquisition by Hologic, Inc. in 2012. He holds a Bachelor of Science degree from the United States Naval Academy and a Master of Business Administration degree from Harvard Business School.

Mr. Sullivan provides the board with valuable insight and guidance through both his current and previous service as the chief executive officer of publicly traded companies as well as his service on the boards of other publicly traded companies, including as chairman. He possesses broad expertise in strategic planning, business development and global marketing. Mr. Sullivan's background in diagnostics and women's health allows him to bring to our board significant knowledge of these important issues and their potential future impact on the Company.

FRANK WITNEY, PhD: *Age 64; Principal Occupation: Former Chief Executive Officer, Affymetrix, Inc., a leading provider of microarray technology; Director of PerkinElmer since 2016. Member of the audit and compensation and benefits committees.*

Dr. Witney most recently served as President and Chief Executive Officer of Affymetrix, Inc., which specialized in microarray technology and cellular analysis, from 2011 through March 2016 when it was acquired by Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc. Previously, Dr. Witney was President and Chief Executive Officer of Dionex Corp., a market leading ion and high performance liquid chromatography company from 2009 to 2011. Prior to that, Dr. Witney served as Executive Vice President and Chief Commercial Officer of Affymetrix from 2008 to 2009, following its acquisition of Panomics, Inc., a quantitative biology company, which Dr. Witney had led as President and Chief Executive Officer from 2002 to 2008. He previously held the role of President of PerkinElmer's Drug Discovery Tools division following PerkinElmer's acquisition of Packard BioScience in 2001, where he served as President and Chief Operating Officer. Dr. Witney also held several positions at Bio-Rad Laboratories beginning in 1983, leading that company's efforts to enter the proteomic and bioassay technologies market. Dr. Witney was a post-doctoral fellow at the National Institutes of Health and holds a PhD in molecular and cell biology and a Master of Science degree in microbiology from Indiana University, as well as a Bachelor of Science degree in microbiology from the University of Illinois. Dr. Witney is a member of the board of directors of publicly traded Cerus Corporation, as well as the Chairman of the Board of Gyros

Protein Technologies AB, and a member of the board of RareCyte, Inc., Genoptix, Inc., Emulate, Inc.,

Table of Contents

and GenapSys, Inc., all of which are privately held, and is an Operating Partner at Ampersand Capital Partners.

Dr. Witney brings to our board deep market knowledge and over 30 years of leadership experience across the life sciences, diagnostics and analytical instruments industries, including as a chief executive officer and board member. Through this experience, he has developed expertise in several valued areas including strategic product development, business development and operational management.

PASCALE WITZ: *Age 51; Principal Occupation: Founder and Chief Executive Officer, PWH Advisors. Director of PerkinElmer since October 2017.*

Ms. Witz has served as the Chief Executive Officer of PWH Advisors, a consulting services firm for healthcare companies, since founding the firm in 2016. Previously, Ms. Witz served as the Executive Vice President, Diabetes & Cardiovascular for Sanofi, S.A. from September 2015 through May 2016, having formerly held the position of Executive Vice President, Global Divisions and Strategic Development for Sanofi from July 2013. Before joining Sanofi, Ms. Witz was employed in positions of increasing responsibility with GE Healthcare starting in 1996, most recently serving as the President and Chief Executive Officer of Medical Diagnostics from March 2009 through June 2013. Ms. Witz currently serves on the boards of Horizon Pharma Plc, Regulus Therapeutics, Inc., Fresenius Medical Care AG & Co. KGaA and Savencia SA. She is also a director of the not-for-profit French-American Foundation France and the Global Alzheimer's Platform Foundation. Ms. Witz received her Master of Science degree in biochemistry from the Institut National des Sciences Appliquées de Lyon, France and her Master of Business Administration degree from INSEAD, Fontainebleau, France. She was also a doctoral student in molecular biology at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Strasbourg, France.

Ms. Witz brings to our board more than two decades of experience in the global life sciences industry, both as an executive officer and as a board member at publicly traded companies. Her in-depth knowledge of many of the markets that the Company serves allows her to assist the Board with regard to both current operational decision making as well as longer term resource utilization and strategic planning.

10 [PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement](#)

Table of Contents

**INFORMATION RELATING TO OUR BOARD OF
DIRECTORS AND ITS COMMITTEES**

Determination of Independence

Our common stock is listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Under current NYSE rules, a director of PerkinElmer qualifies as independent only if our board of directors affirmatively determines that the director has no material relationship with PerkinElmer, either directly or as a partner, shareholder or officer of an organization that has a relationship with PerkinElmer. Our board of directors evaluates the independence of our directors on an annual basis. In evaluating potentially material relationships, our board considers commercial, industrial, banking, counseling, legal, accounting, charitable and familial relationships, among others. Our board of directors has determined that none of Messrs. Barrett, Chapin, Lopardo, Michas, or Sullivan, Ms. Witz, or Drs. Grégoire or Witney, has a material relationship with PerkinElmer, and also that each of these directors is independent as determined under Section 303A.02(b) of the NYSE Listed Company Manual.

Director Candidates

Our shareholders may recommend director candidates for inclusion by the board of directors in the slate of nominees the board recommends to our shareholders for election. The qualifications of recommended candidates will be reviewed by the nominating and corporate governance committee. If the board determines to nominate a shareholder-recommended candidate and recommends his or her election as a director by the shareholders, the name will be included on our proxy card for the shareholders meeting at which his or her election is recommended.

Shareholders may recommend individuals for the nominating and corporate governance committee to consider as potential director candidates by submitting their names, together with appropriate biographical information and background materials, and a statement as to whether the shareholder or group of shareholders making the recommendation has beneficially owned more than 5% of our common stock for at least a year as of the date such recommendation is made. Materials should be mailed to the PerkinElmer Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee c/o Office of the General Counsel, PerkinElmer, Inc., 940 Winter Street, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451. The nominating and corporate governance committee will consider a proposed director candidate only if appropriate biographical information and background material are provided on a timely basis. The process followed by the nominating and corporate governance committee to identify and evaluate candidates may include requests to board members and others for recommendations, meetings from time to time to evaluate biographical information and background material relating to potential candidates, and interviews of selected candidates by members of the nominating and corporate governance committee and the board of directors. Assuming that appropriate biographical and background material are provided for candidates recommended by shareholders, the nominating and corporate governance committee will evaluate those candidates by following substantially the same process as outlined above, and applying substantially the same criteria, as for candidates submitted by board members.

Shareholders also have the right under our By-laws to nominate director candidates directly, without any action or recommendation on the part of the nominating and corporate governance committee or our board, by following the process for shareholder proposals for election of directors set forth in our By-laws and discussed in Shareholder Proposals for 2019 Annual Meeting of Shareholders, below. Candidates nominated by shareholders in accordance with these procedures will not be included in our proxy card for the shareholder meeting at which his or her

nomination is recommended.

Table of Contents**Criteria and Diversity**

In considering whether to recommend any candidate for inclusion in the board of directors' slate of recommended director nominees, including candidates recommended by shareholders, the nominating and corporate governance committee will apply the criteria set forth in PerkinElmer's corporate governance guidelines and such other factors as the committee deems appropriate. These criteria include the candidate's experience, skills, and independence. In evaluating a candidate's experience and skills, the nominating and corporate governance committee may also consider qualities such as an understanding of technologies, marketing, finance, regulation and public policy, and international issues. In evaluating a candidate's independence, the nominating and corporate governance committee will consider the applicable independence standards of the NYSE and the Securities and Exchange Commission. The nominating and corporate governance committee will evaluate each director candidate in the context of the perceived needs of the board, the best interests of PerkinElmer and its shareholders, as well as our corporate governance guidelines which specify that the composition of the board should reflect diversity. Accordingly, the nominating and corporate governance committee seeks nominees with a broad range of experience, professions, skills and backgrounds. The nominating and corporate governance committee does not assign specific weights to particular criteria, and no particular criterion is necessarily applicable to all prospective nominees. We believe that the backgrounds and qualifications of the directors, considered as a group, should provide a significant composite mix of experience, knowledge and abilities that will allow our board to fulfill its responsibilities. Nominees are not discriminated against on the basis of race, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, disability or any other basis proscribed by law.

The nominating and corporate governance committee, as part of its annual assessment of board performance, reviews the diversity of experience, attributes and skills considered necessary for the optimal functioning of the board. The committee reviews the experience, attributes and skills currently represented on the board, as well as those areas where a change could improve the overall quality of our board and the ability of the board to perform its responsibilities. The committee then establishes those areas that could be the focus of a director search, if necessary. The effectiveness of the board's diverse mix of experience, attributes and skills is reviewed as a component of the annual board self-assessment process.

Leadership Structure

Our board of directors selects a Chairman of the board by evaluating the criteria and using a process that the board considers to be in the best interests of the Company and its shareholders, pursuant to our corporate governance guidelines. Our board of directors does not have a fixed policy on whether the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman should be separate positions or whether the Chairman should be an employee or non-employee. Currently, Mr. Friel serves as our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. Mr. Friel has in-depth knowledge of the issues and opportunities facing the Company, allowing him to effectively develop agendas designed to focus the board's time and attention on the most critical matters, while also leading the discussion of those matters and ultimately the execution of the resulting strategic initiatives. The combined role promotes decisive leadership and clear accountability. Our corporate governance guidelines require that if the Chief Executive Officer is also Chairman, then there should be a Lead Director elected annually by the board from the independent directors. The Chair of the nominating and corporate governance committee leads an annual process for electing a Lead Director. Mr. Michas currently serves as our Lead Director. The primary responsibilities of the Lead Director include communication with the Chief Executive Officer, initiating and chairing meetings of the independent directors, and counseling the Chief Executive Officer and directors as needed. Our board holds executive sessions of the independent directors preceding or following each regularly scheduled board meeting. We believe that the current leadership structure, which combines Mr. Friel's almost two decades of executive experience with the Company in a variety of key leadership roles with Mr. Michas' demonstrated understanding of the role played by boards of directors, allows the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer to set the overall direction of the Company and provide day-to-day leadership, while having the benefit of the Lead Director's

counsel and corporate governance experience.

12 PerkinElmer *2018 Proxy Statement*

Table of Contents

Communications from Shareholders and Other Interested Parties

Our board of directors will give appropriate attention to written communications on issues that are submitted by shareholders and other interested parties, and will respond if and as appropriate.

Shareholders and other interested parties who wish to communicate with our entire board may do so by writing to Robert F. Friel, Chairman, PerkinElmer, Inc., 940 Winter Street, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451. Shareholders and other interested parties who wish to communicate with our non-management directors should address such communications to Alexis P. Michas, Lead Director, c/o Office of the General Counsel, PerkinElmer, Inc., 940 Winter Street, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451. Communications will be forwarded to other directors if the communications relate to substantive matters that the Chairman or the Lead Director, as the case may be, in consultation with our General Counsel, considers appropriate for attention by the other directors. In general, communications relating to corporate governance and long-term corporate strategy are more likely to be forwarded than communications relating to ordinary business affairs, personal grievances or matters as to which we tend to receive repetitive or duplicative communications.

Board of Directors Role in Risk Oversight

Our board of directors has an active role in overseeing risks that could affect the Company, including operational, financial, legal and regulatory, and strategic and reputational risks. This oversight is conducted primarily through the audit committee, which has been assigned responsibility for enterprise risk management and reports regularly to our board on such matters. Senior management carries out the functional performance of enterprise risk management activities, with access to external service providers as needed. This process includes periodic reporting by management to the audit committee in order to systematically identify, analyze, prioritize and document potential business risks, their potential impact on the Company's performance, and the Company's ability to detect, manage, control and prevent these risks. When the audit committee receives a report from senior management, the Chair of the audit committee reports on the discussion to the full board during the next board meeting. This enables the board and its committees to coordinate the overall risk oversight role, particularly with respect to risk areas that may potentially impact more than one committee of the board of directors.

In addition to the role our audit committee plays in overseeing enterprise risk management activities, our compensation and benefits committee monitors the design and implementation of our compensation programs to ensure that these programs include the elements needed to motivate employees to take a long-term view of the business and to avoid encouraging unnecessary risk taking. Based on a functional review of our compensation policies and practices as performed by senior management in consultation with our compensation and benefits committee, we do not believe that any risks arising from our employee compensation programs are likely to have a material adverse effect on the Company.

Board of Directors Meetings and Committees

Our board of directors has responsibility for establishing broad corporate policies and for reviewing overall performance, rather than day-to-day operations. The board's primary responsibility is to oversee the management of the Company and, in so doing, serve the best interests of our Company and its shareholders. The board selects, evaluates and provides for the succession of our executive officers. It reviews and approves corporate objectives and strategies, and evaluates significant policies and proposed major commitments of corporate resources. It participates in decisions that have a potential major economic impact on PerkinElmer. Management keeps the directors informed of Company activity through regular written reports and presentations at board and committee meetings. The board participates in an annual self-evaluation process.

Our board of directors met nine times in fiscal 2017. During fiscal 2017, each director attended 75% or more of the total combined number of meetings of the board and the committees of which

Table of Contents

such director was a member. Members of our board of directors are strongly encouraged to attend our annual meeting of shareholders. If attendance in person is not possible, members of the board of directors are strongly encouraged to attend our annual meeting of shareholders via telephone or similar communication equipment. In 2017, all of our directors attended our annual meeting of shareholders either in person or by telephone.

Mr. Friel is the only director who is also an employee of PerkinElmer. He does not participate in the portions of any meetings at which his compensation is determined.

Our board's standing committees are audit, finance, nominating and corporate governance, and compensation and benefits. Each committee has a charter that has been approved by the board. Each committee must review the appropriateness of its charter and perform a self-evaluation at least annually. You can access our committee charters and corporate governance guidelines under "Corporate Governance", and our standards of business conduct under "Corporate Social Responsibility", in the "About" section of the "Company" tab of our website, www.perkinelmer.com, or you may request a copy by writing to PerkinElmer, Inc., 940 Winter Street, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451, Attention: Investor Relations.

Audit Committee

Our audit committee assists the board of directors in overseeing the integrity of our financial statements, our compliance with legal and regulatory requirements, our independent registered public accounting firm's qualifications and independence, risk assessment, the performance of our internal audit function and our independent registered public accounting firm. The current members of our audit committee are Messrs. Chapin (Chair), Lopardo and Sullivan and Dr. Witney. Our board of directors has determined that Mr. Chapin qualifies as an "audit committee financial expert" as defined by applicable rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Each of Messrs. Chapin, Lopardo and Sullivan and Dr. Witney is an "independent director" under the rules of the NYSE governing the qualifications of the members of audit committees, including the additional independence requirements of Rule 10A-3 for audit committees under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, which we refer to in this proxy statement as the Exchange Act. In addition, our board has determined that each member of the audit committee is financially literate and that Mr. Chapin has accounting and/or related financial management expertise as required under the rules of the NYSE. None of Messrs. Chapin, Lopardo and Sullivan or Dr. Witney serves on the audit committees of more than two other public companies. The audit committee held nine meetings during fiscal 2017.

Finance Committee

Our finance committee considers and approves the specific terms of debt and equity securities to be issued by PerkinElmer, and indebtedness and off-balance sheet transactions to be entered into by PerkinElmer. The finance committee also considers and approves transactions affecting our capital structure. The current members of our finance committee are Messrs. Lopardo (Chair), Chapin, Friel and Michas. The board of directors has determined that each of Messrs. Chapin, Lopardo and Michas is independent as defined under the rules of the NYSE. Mr. Friel is our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. Our finance committee held two meetings during fiscal 2017.

Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee

Our nominating and corporate governance committee identifies qualified director candidates, recommends to the board of directors the persons to be nominated by the board as directors at the annual meeting of shareholders, reviews and recommends changes to our corporate governance principles, and oversees the evaluation of the board. Our nominating and corporate governance committee also adopted and oversees our related party transactions policy. The current members of the nominating and corporate governance committee are Messrs. Michas (Chair) and Barrett and

Dr. Grégoire. The board has determined that each of Messrs. Michas and Barrett and Dr. Grégoire is independent as defined under the rules of the NYSE. The nominating and corporate governance

14 [PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement](#)

Table of Contents

committee has the authority under its charter to retain, review fees for, and terminate advisors and consultants as it deems necessary to assist in the fulfillment of its responsibilities. For information relating to nominations of directors by our shareholders, see [Director Candidates](#) above. For information concerning our related party transactions policy, see [Certain Relationships and Policies on Related Party Transactions](#) below. Our nominating and corporate governance committee met five times during fiscal 2017.

Compensation and Benefits Committee

Our compensation and benefits committee discharges the responsibilities of our board relating to the compensation and benefits of our Chief Executive Officer and our other executive officers, and reviews and makes recommendations to the nominating and corporate governance committee regarding director compensation. The compensation and benefits committee also oversees the performance evaluation of our Chief Executive Officer by our board. In addition, the compensation and benefits committee grants equity (stock options, restricted shares and other stock incentives) to our officers and administers our incentive compensation and executive benefit plans. The compensation and benefits committee also reviews and approves recommendations from our management-run administrative committee concerning terminations of broad-based, non-executive benefit plans, as well as material design changes to those plans that would result in significant cost or increased risk to the Company.

The current members of the compensation and benefits committee are Mr. Sullivan (Chair), Mr. Barrett, Dr. Grégoire, and Dr. Witney. Our board has determined that each of Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Barrett, Dr. Grégoire, and Dr. Witney is independent as defined under the rules of the NYSE regarding independence of compensation committee members. Our compensation and benefits committee held six meetings during fiscal year 2017.

The compensation and benefits committee has the authority under its charter to directly retain, review fees for, and terminate advisors and consultants as it deems necessary to assist in the fulfillment of its responsibilities. The committee has retained Frederic W. Cook & Co., Inc. as its independent compensation consultant to assist the committee with its responsibilities related to our executive and board compensation programs. The Compensation Discussion and Analysis in this proxy statement provides additional information regarding the compensation and benefits committee's processes and procedures for evaluating and determining executive officer compensation.

Compensation Committee Interlocks and Insider Participation

For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017, the members of the compensation and benefits committee were Mr. Sullivan (Chair), Mr. Barrett, Dr. Grégoire, Dr. Vicki L. Sato, Mr. Kenton J. Sicchitano and Dr. Witney. Dr. Sato and Mr. Sicchitano left the committee on April 25, 2017, the date of our 2017 annual meeting of shareholders, at which they did not stand for re-election to our board of directors, and Mr. Barrett and Dr. Witney joined the committee on that date.

None of our executive officers has served as a director or member of the compensation committee of any other entity while any executive officer of that entity served as a director or member of our compensation and benefits committee.

Report of the Audit Committee

The audit committee has:

Edgar Filing: PERKINELMER INC - Form DEF 14A

Reviewed and discussed with management our audited financial statements as of and for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017;

Discussed with Deloitte & Touche LLP, our independent registered public accounting firm, the matters required by Public Company Accounting Oversight Board Auditing Standard No. 1301 Communications with Audit Committees;

PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement 15

Table of Contents

Discussed with Deloitte & Touche LLP the matters required to be reviewed pursuant to Rule 207 of Regulation S-X;

Reviewed the qualifications and performance of Deloitte & Touche LLP and our internal audit function;

Received and reviewed the written disclosures and the letter from Deloitte & Touche LLP pursuant to applicable requirements of the PCAOB regarding the independent registered public accounting firm's communications with the audit committee concerning the independent registered public accounting firm's independence, and has discussed with the independent registered public accounting firm, the independent registered public accounting firm's independence; and

Based on the review and discussions referred to above, recommended to the board of directors that the audited financial statements referred to above be included in our annual report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017 for filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The audit committee is pleased to submit this report to the shareholders.

By the audit committee of the board of directors:

Samuel R. Chapin, Chair

Nicholas A. Lopardo

Patrick J. Sullivan

Frank Witney

Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm Fees and Other Matters

The following table presents the aggregate fees billed for services rendered by Deloitte & Touche LLP, the member firms of Deloitte & Touche Tohmatsu and their respective affiliates, in the identified categories for fiscal 2017 and fiscal 2016:

	Fiscal 2017	Fiscal 2016
Audit Fees	\$ 3,628,000	\$ 3,527,000
Audit-Related Fees	804,000	210,000
Tax Fees	1,335,000	550,000
All Other Fees	5,000	5,000
Total Fees	\$ 5,772,000	\$ 4,292,000

Audit Fees

These are fees related to professional services rendered in connection with the audit of our annual financial statements, the reviews of the interim financial statements included in each of our quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, and other professional services provided by our independent registered public accounting firm in connection with statutory or regulatory filings or engagements.

Audit-Related Fees

These are fees for assurance and related services that are reasonably related to performance of the audit and review of our financial statements, and which are not reported under Audit Fees. These services consisted primarily of audits of employee benefit plans, and for fiscal 2017, audit procedures performed related to divestitures, consultations regarding accounting and financial reporting, and attestation services for such matters as required for consents related to registration statements and other filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Table of Contents

Tax Fees

These are fees billed for professional services for tax compliance, tax advice and tax planning services. Tax compliance services which relate to preparation of original and amended non-US corporate income tax returns (fees for which amounted to \$198,000 in fiscal 2017 and \$234,000 in fiscal 2016) and expatriate tax return preparation and assistance (fees for which amounted to \$196,000 in fiscal 2017 and \$207,000 in fiscal 2016) accounted for \$394,000 of the total tax fees paid for in fiscal 2017 and \$441,000 of the total tax fees paid for in fiscal 2016. Tax advice and planning services, including consultations on foreign transactions, assistance with tax audits and appeals, tax advice related to reorganizations, mergers and acquisitions, employee benefit plans and requests for rulings or technical advice from taxing authorities, amounted to \$942,000 in fiscal 2017 and \$110,000 in fiscal 2016.

All Other Fees

Fees paid or incurred for other services amounted to \$5,000 in fiscal 2017 and \$5,000 in fiscal 2016.

Audit Committee's Pre-approval Policy and Procedures

The audit committee of our board of directors has adopted policies and procedures for the pre-approval of audit and non-audit services for the purpose of maintaining the independence of our independent registered public accounting firm. We may not engage our independent registered public accounting firm to render any audit or non-audit service unless either the service is approved in advance by the audit committee, or the engagement to render the service is entered into pursuant to the audit committee's pre-approval policies and procedures. On an annual basis, the audit committee may pre-approve services that are expected to be provided to PerkinElmer by the independent registered public accounting firm during the following 12 months. At the time such pre-approval is granted, the audit committee must (1) identify the particular pre-approved services in a sufficient level of detail so that our management will not be called upon to make a judgment as to whether a proposed service fits within the pre-approved services and (2) establish a monetary limit with respect to the total pre-approved services, which limit may not be exceeded without obtaining further pre-approval under the policy.

Our management periodically provides the audit committee updates of proposed services for pre-approval. Any additional services which fall outside the scope of the annual service review process require advance approval by the audit committee. The audit committee may delegate to one or more designated members of the committee the authority to grant pre-approvals of permitted services, or classes of permitted services, to be provided by the independent registered public accounting firm. The decisions of a designated member to pre-approve a permitted service are reported to the audit committee at its next regularly scheduled meeting. While controls have been established to identify all services rendered by the independent registered public accounting firm, the audit committee recognizes that there may be some de minimis services provided that, while considered permitted services, may not be identified as non-audit services or reported immediately because of their de minimis nature. Such services may be approved prior to the completion of the audit by either the audit committee, or a designated member of the audit committee.

Certain Relationships and Policies on Related Party Transactions

The nominating and corporate governance committee of our board of directors has adopted written policies and procedures for the review of any transaction, arrangement or relationship in which PerkinElmer was or is to be a participant, and in which one of our executive officers, directors, director nominees or 5% stockholders (or their immediate family members), or any entity in which persons listed above, either individually or in the aggregate, has a greater than 10% ownership interest, each of whom we refer to as a related party, has or will have a direct or indirect

material interest, as determined by the committee. We refer to these transactions as related party transactions.

Table of Contents

The policy calls for any proposed related party transaction to be reviewed and, if deemed appropriate, approved by our nominating and corporate governance committee. Whenever practicable, the review and approval will occur prior to entry into the transaction. If advance approval is not practicable, the committee will review, and, in its discretion, may approve the related party transaction. The policy also permits the Chair of the committee to review and, if deemed appropriate, approve proposed related party transactions that arise between committee meetings, in which case the Chair will report such transactions to the committee at its next meeting. Any related party transactions that are ongoing in nature will be reviewed annually. The committee will review and consider such information regarding the related party transaction as it deems appropriate under the circumstances.

The committee has determined that certain types of transactions, such as those excluded by the instructions to the Securities and Exchange Commission's related person transaction disclosure rule, do not create a material direct or indirect interest on behalf of related parties and, therefore, are not related party transactions for purposes of this policy.

The committee may approve a related party transaction only if the committee determines that, under all of the circumstances, the transaction is in the best interest of PerkinElmer and its shareholders.

Table of Contents**DIRECTOR COMPENSATION**

Directors who are employees of PerkinElmer receive no additional compensation for their services as directors. Our compensation and benefits committee periodically reviews our non-employee director compensation policies with the assistance of the compensation consultant, and makes recommendations to our nominating and corporate governance committee for that committee's proposal to our board. The compensation consultant provides data on director compensation programs at a number of companies identified by the compensation and benefits committee and the compensation consultant as industry peers.

Our director compensation program is designed to provide a competitive level of compensation and to enable PerkinElmer to attract and retain highly-qualified board members. Annual compensation for our non-employee directors consists of a cash retainer and equity compensation. Each of these components for 2017 is shown in the following table and explained further below.

2017 Director Compensation

Name (1)	Fees Earned or Paid in Cash (\$)(2)	Stock Awards (\$)(3)	Option Awards (\$)(4)	Total (\$)
Peter Barrett	\$ 90,000	\$ 174,956		\$ 264,956
Samuel R. Chapin	\$ 108,750	\$ 174,956		\$ 283,706
Sylvie Gregoire, PharmD	\$ 90,000	\$ 174,956		\$ 264,956
Nicholas A. Lopardo	\$ 90,000	\$ 174,956		\$ 264,956
Alexis P. Michas	\$ 159,000	\$ 174,956		\$ 333,956
Vicki L. Sato, PhD (5)	\$ 25,500			\$ 25,500
Kenton J. Sicchitano (5)	\$ 28,750			\$ 28,750
Patrick J. Sullivan	\$ 105,000	\$ 174,956		\$ 279,956
Frank R. Witney, PhD	\$ 90,000	\$ 174,956		\$ 264,956
Pascale Witz	\$ 30,000	\$ 102,112		\$ 132,112

NOTES

- (1) Robert F. Friel, who serves on our board, was compensated as an executive officer of the Company and did not receive any additional compensation in association with his role as a director in 2017. His compensation is reported in the Summary Compensation Table, below.
- (2) Variations in cash retainer amounts paid to individual directors in 2017 reflect additional retainer amounts paid to our Lead Director and directors holding committee Chair roles, as well as a prorated retainer paid to Ms. Witz reflecting the period of time she served on the board in 2017.

- (3) The grant date fair value of the annual restricted stock unit grant to each non-employee director other than Ms. Witz in 2017 was \$74,985. The grant date fair value of the annual share grant to each non-employee director other than Ms. Witz in 2017 was \$99,971, and these shares were not subject to restriction or vesting. Upon joining our board on October 27, 2017, Ms. Witz received a restricted stock unit grant and a share grant with grant date fair values of \$43,785 and \$58,327, respectively. These amounts represent the aggregate grant date fair value of awards of restricted stock units and shares granted to each listed director in fiscal year 2017. For a more detailed description of the assumptions used for purposes of determining grant date fair value, see Note 18 to the consolidated financial statements in our annual report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017.

Table of Contents

(4) Total outstanding stock options held by our non-employee directors as of December 31, 2017 were as follows: Mr. Barrett: 10,351; Dr. Grégoire: 10,000; Mr. Michas: 24,050; and Mr. Sullivan: 17,422. Each of Messrs. Barrett, Chapin, Lopardo, Michas and Sullivan and Drs. Grégoire and Witney held 1,204 unvested restricted stock units as of December 31, 2017. Ms. Witz held 618 unvested restricted stock units as of December 31, 2017. Our non-employee directors receive annual share grants which are not subject to restriction and therefore held no shares of restricted stock as of December 31, 2017. Each of our non-employee directors holds shares of our common stock in amounts which satisfy our director stock ownership guidelines as described under *Director Stock Ownership Guidelines*, below. PerkinElmer common stock held by each of our non-employee directors as of February 15, 2018 is reported under *Beneficial Ownership of Common Stock* below.

(5) Dr. Sato and Mr. Sicchitano retired from our board on April 25, 2017.

Board Compensation

Our board service year begins on the date of our annual meeting of shareholders. Our non-employee directors are paid the compensation described below for their service during the board service year.

Annual Cash Retainer

For 2017, each of our current non-employee directors was paid an annual cash retainer of \$90,000 which was paid in four quarterly installments. Quarterly cash retainer installments are paid in May, August, November and February, which is the first month of each of the successive three-month periods following the annual meeting of shareholders.

Our Lead Director and the Chairs of our audit, compensation and benefits and nominating and corporate governance committees are each paid an additional retainer in recognition of the further responsibilities carried by these roles. For 2017, our Lead Director was paid an additional annual cash retainer of \$60,000 and the Chairs of our audit, compensation and benefits, and nominating and corporate governance committees were paid additional annual cash retainers of \$25,000, \$15,000 and \$12,000, respectively.

The cash retainer is prorated to the nearest whole month for non-employee directors who serve for only a portion of the year. The retainer is also prorated for any director who attends fewer than 75% of the aggregate of the meetings of our board and the meetings of committees on which the director is a member. All of our directors fulfilled the meeting requirement in fiscal year 2017.

Equity Compensation

Our non-employee directors receive a portion of their annual compensation in the form of equity grants in two parts. A portion of the annual equity compensation is delivered in the form of an award of our common stock. The second portion is delivered in the form of a grant of restricted stock units, or RSUs, which vests 100% on the first anniversary of the date of grant. Prior to fiscal 2015, this second portion of the annual non-employee director equity compensation consisted of a stock option grant which vested in three equal annual installments beginning on the first anniversary of the date of grant. Each component of our non-employee equity compensation program is described in more detail below.

Stock Awards: In 2017, each non-employee director serving on our board on the annual grant date was awarded 1,598 shares of our common stock with a fair market value of \$100,000. The number of shares granted was determined by dividing the grant value by the fair market value of our stock on the date of grant. The granted shares are not subject to restrictions or vesting. We granted these awards on May 9, 2017, the annual grant date, which was

the first day of the open trading window following our first quarter earnings release.

20 PerkinElmer *2018 Proxy Statement*

Table of Contents

Restricted Stock Units: In 2017, each non-employee director serving on our board on the annual grant date was awarded a grant of RSUs. Each RSU entitles the holder to receive one share of our common stock upon vesting. The number of RSUs granted was determined by dividing the fair market value by the Black-Scholes value of an RSU on the date of grant. Each of our non-employee directors serving on the board on the annual grant date of May 9, 2017 was awarded 1,204 RSUs. The annual RSU grant will fully vest on the first anniversary of the date of grant or, if earlier, upon the director's death, disability or qualifying retirement, or the termination of the director's service within 12 months following a change in control.

Stock Options: Our non-employee directors who served on our board prior to fiscal 2016 hold options to purchase shares of our common stock that were granted to them as part of their annual equity compensation in years prior to fiscal 2016. Stock options granted to non-employee directors since 2005 vest in three equal annual installments beginning one year from the grant date, and may be exercised for seven years from the grant date. All options granted to non-employee directors have an exercise price equal to the fair market value of our stock on the date of grant and become exercisable in full upon a change in control. Directors who leave our board have three months after their departure to exercise their vested options, after which the options are cancelled, unless the departure is due to death or disability, in which case the options may be exercised for up to one year, or retirement from our board, in which case options vest 100% and may be exercised for three years after their departure. Directors qualify for retirement for purposes of our stock option awards after attaining both age 55 and ten years of service to the Company as a director.

New Director Compensation

New non-employee directors who serve for only a portion of the board service year receive a cash retainer and annual equity grants prorated to reflect the period he or she is anticipated to serve on our board during that year. In connection with joining our board in October 2017, Ms. Witz received a prorated cash retainer of \$7,500, a prorated stock grant of 820 shares, and a prorated grant of 618 RSUs. The equity awards were granted to Ms. Witz on November 15, 2017.

Deferred Compensation Plan

Non-employee directors have previously been provided with the opportunity to defer receipt of all or a portion of their cash retainer or stock awards into our 2008 Deferred Compensation Plan. In December 2010, the compensation and benefits committee amended this plan to eliminate new deferral elections from participants, including deferrals of director cash retainer or stock awards, for plan years beginning January 1, 2011 or later. None of the non-employee directors had an active election to defer compensation during fiscal year 2017, and due to the plan amendment, no new deferral elections will be accepted. For more information about our deferred compensation program, see [Executive Compensation 2017 Non-Qualified Deferred Compensation Non-Qualified Deferred Compensation Plan](#) below.

Business Travel Accident Insurance

Non-employee directors are provided with \$250,000 of death benefit coverage under PerkinElmer's business travel accident insurance policy which provides coverage while traveling on PerkinElmer business.

Director Stock Ownership Guidelines

Within five years of election to our board, we expect each non-employee director to own PerkinElmer stock with a fair market value equal to at least five times the annual cash retainer. For fiscal 2017, this value was \$450,000. Shares held in the deferred compensation plan are counted as owned for purposes of these guidelines. As of February 15, 2018, all of our directors were in compliance with our stock ownership guidelines. See [Beneficial Ownership of Common Stock](#)

below for the beneficial stock ownership of our directors.

Table of Contents

Changes to Director Compensation

Our compensation and benefits committee periodically reviews and makes recommendations to the nominating and corporate governance committee regarding director compensation and director compensation guidelines. Our director compensation, including annual retainers and stock and option awards, is therefore subject to adjustment.

.

22 PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement

Table of Contents**BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP OF COMMON STOCK**

The following table shows the number of shares of our common stock beneficially owned on February 15, 2018 by (1) each of the directors and nominees for director individually, (2) each of the executive officers named in the Summary Compensation Table below, (3) any person known to us to own beneficially more than five percent of our outstanding common stock and (4) all executive officers and directors as a group. The beneficial ownership set forth below includes any shares that the person has the right to acquire within 60 days after February 15, 2018 through the exercise or conversion of any stock option or other right.

Name (1)	Stock	Stock-Based Holdings (2)	Acquirable Within 60 Days (3)	Total Shares Beneficially Owned (4)	Percent of Class
BlackRock, Inc. (5)	6,260,111			6,260,111	5.7%
Capital Research Global Investors (6)	7,636,530			7,636,530	6.9%
Janus Henderson Group plc (7)	6,354,160			6,354,160	5.8%
Select Equity Group, L.P. (8)	7,171,114			7,171,114	6.5%
T. Rowe Price Associates, Inc. (9)	13,905,996			13,905,996	12.6%
The Vanguard Group, Inc. (10)	11,505,211			11,505,211	10.4%
Peter Barrett	17,996		10,351	28,347	*
Samuel R. Chapin	3,608			3,608	*
James Corbett	43,019		94,796	137,815	*
Robert F. Friel	572,657		832,517	1,405,174	1.3%
Joel S. Goldberg	62,311		140,602	202,913	*
Sylvie Grégoire, PharmD	8,369		10,000	18,369	*
Nicholas A. Lopardo	20,924	36,291		57,215	*
Alexis P. Michas	40,442	10,024	24,050	74,516	*
Prahlad R. Singh	18,063		28,530	46,593	*
Patrick J. Sullivan	35,119		17,422	52,541	*
Frank A. Wilson	61,719	206	103,656	165,581	*
Frank Witney, PhD	4,354			4,354	*
Pascale Witz	820			820	*
All executive officers and directors of the Company as a group, 17 in number	920,722	46,529	1,317,579	2,284,830	2.1%

NOTES

* Less than 1%

- (1) Except to the extent noted below, each individual or entity has sole voting and investment power over the shares of common stock identified in the table as beneficially owned by the individual, other than shares accrued under our deferred compensation plan that may not be sold until distributed from the plan, and shares of restricted stock which may not be sold until they have fully vested.

- (2) This column represents indirect holdings of PerkinElmer's common stock, including, for example, investments in the PerkinElmer stock fund selected by the employee in our retirement savings plan, and shares that are accrued under deferred compensation arrangements and are payable 100% in common stock at the time of distribution. This column also includes shares held by spouses, minor children and trusts.

Table of Contents

- (3) Represents shares of common stock that may be acquired within 60 days after February 15, 2018 upon the exercise of outstanding stock options and the vesting of restricted stock units.
- (4) Represents the sum of the shares set forth for the individual in each of the Stock, Stock-Based Holdings and Acquirable Within 60 Days columns.
- (5) Based on information set forth in a Schedule 13G filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on January 29, 2018 by BlackRock, Inc., reporting sole power to vote or direct the vote over 5,631,025 shares, and sole power to dispose or direct the disposition of 6,260,111 shares. The address of BlackRock, Inc. is 55 East 52nd Street, New York, New York 10055.
- (6) Based on information set forth in a Schedule 13G filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on February 14, 2018 by Capital Research Global Investors, a division of Capital Research and Management Company, reporting sole power to vote or direct the vote over, and sole power to dispose or direct the disposition of 7,636,530 shares. The address of Capital Research Global Investors is 333 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, California 90071.
- (7) Based on information set forth in a Schedule 13G filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on February 14, 2018 by Janus Henderson Group plc, reporting shared power to vote or direct the vote over, and shared power to dispose or direct the disposition of 6,354,160 shares. The address of Janus Henderson Group plc is 201 Bishopgate EC2M 3AE, United Kingdom.
- (8) Based on information set forth in a Schedule 13G filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on February 14, 2018 by Select Equity Group, L.P., reporting shared power to vote or direct the vote over, and shared power to dispose or direct the disposition of 7,171,114 shares. The address of Select Equity Group, L.P. is 380 Lafayette Street, 6th Floor, New York, New York 10003.
- (9) Based on information set forth in a Schedule 13G filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on February 14, 2018 by T. Rowe Price Associates, Inc., reporting sole power to vote or direct the vote over 3,087,422 shares, and sole power to dispose or direct the disposition of 13,905,996 shares. The address of T. Rowe Price Associates, Inc. is 100 E. Pratt Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202.
- (10) Based on information set forth in a Schedule 13G filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on February 9, 2018 by The Vanguard Group, Inc., reporting sole power to vote or direct the vote over 129,113 shares, shared power to vote or direct the vote over 13,327 shares, sole power to dispose or direct the disposition of 11,371,260 shares, and shared power to dispose or direct the disposition of 133,951 shares. The address of The Vanguard Group, Inc. is 100 Vanguard Boulevard, Malvern, Pennsylvania 19355.

Table of Contents**EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION****Compensation Discussion and Analysis**

PerkinElmer is a global leader in the diagnostic, life sciences research, food, environmental, industrial and laboratory services markets. Through our advanced technologies and differentiated solutions, we address critical issues that help to improve lives and the world around us. We operate in scientific, fast-paced, ever-evolving markets in which there is a high level of competition for market share and limited talent. The goals of our executive compensation program are to attract, retain and motivate talented executives to enable the Company to be successful in a highly competitive environment. The structure of our executive compensation program supports our business strategy by driving top-line growth while remaining focused on profitability and increased operating productivity, and creating sustainable market positions for our products, technology and services. We believe this enhances the value of our shareholders investment and, over time, will generate sustainable shareholder value through stock price appreciation.

Our executive compensation program is a robust, highly performance-driven program intended to generate both long-term sustainable shareholder value and near-term focus on financial performance, operational excellence, quality and innovation. We accomplish this through two primary incentive vehicles in addition to base pay. First, to address short-term performance, we have an annual cash incentive plan that we call our Performance Incentive Plan, or PIP, which we also refer to as our short-term incentive program. The PIP operates on a single performance period comprising the full fiscal year. PIP payments are made based on achievement against pre-defined financial targets, which for fiscal year 2017 included organic revenue growth, adjusted earnings per share, or adjusted EPS, and adjusted operating profit. We define organic revenue as revenue adjusted for the impact of items related to foreign exchange, acquisitions, divestitures and certain other items. We define the related term organic revenue growth to refer to the measure of comparing current period organic revenue with the corresponding period of the prior year. We define adjusted EPS as earnings per share adjusted for the impact of items related to acquisitions, business repositioning, mark-to-market on post-retirement benefits and certain other items. We define adjusted operating profit as operating income adjusted for the impact of items related to acquisitions, divestitures, business repositioning, mark-to-market on post-retirement benefits and certain other items.

Second, our executive officers participate in our Long-Term Incentive Program, or LTIP. The LTIP is structured with overlapping three-year performance cycles and in 2017 included four diverse incentive vehicles: restricted stock, performance restricted stock units (PRSUs), performance cash units and stock options. The three-year performance goals in our LTIP are aligned with our strategic planning process and are designed to focus our executives on making and executing decisions that drive growth and create lasting shareholder value.

Executive Summary

To provide context for the full description of our executive compensation programs that follows, we highlight below key information and achievements that impacted our executive compensation program for 2017 and future periods.

Pay for Performance. In 2017, we made significant progress against our strategic priorities and delivered strong financial results. Our positive performance was the result of both strategic investments and execution on operational initiatives. Our key achievements included:

We acquired Tulip Diagnostics Private Limited, or Tulip, and EUROIMMUN Medizinische Labordiagnostika AG, or EUROIMMUN, expanding the scale and scope of our company and positioning us to accelerate long-term growth while making an even greater impact on global health;

Table of Contents

We completed the divestiture of our Medical Imaging business, resulting in a pre-tax book gain of \$180 million, enabling further focus and investment in our target markets;

We increased our R&D investment and launched innovative new solutions, including our whole genome sequencing service focused on inherited and rare diseases. We achieved \$189 million in revenue from new product introductions, an increase of \$66 million over the prior fiscal year;

We grew GAAP revenue by 7% and organic revenue by 4%; our GAAP EPS was \$1.42 and we increased adjusted EPS 12% to \$2.90;

We strengthened our organizational capabilities by completing the formation of our Discovery and Analytical Solutions business, which is strategically focused on opportunities in high-growth markets; and

We elevated our technological and operational capabilities and ended fiscal 2017 with an improved portfolio and wider geographic reach.

A reconciliation of our GAAP results to non-GAAP financial measures can be found in Appendix A to this proxy statement.

Short- and long-term incentive plan payments made to our named executive officers were aligned with our financial results in 2017 as follows:

2017 PIP. Achievement against 2017 PIP financial goals for fiscal 2017 ranged from 102% to 108% of target, reflecting our financial performance at corporate and strategic business unit levels. Fiscal year 2017 performance relative to our PIP goals is described further under **Short-Term Incentive Program** below.

2015 LTIP. The three-year performance period under our 2015 LTIP concluded in fiscal year 2017, resulting in the vesting and payment of performance units granted in 2015. Adjusted revenue growth and adjusted EPS performance in 2015, 2016 and 2017 resulted in 127% achievement against 2015 LTIP financial goals. We define adjusted revenue growth as the three-year simple average of revenue growth calculated on a constant currency basis. Performance unit goals and payments under the 2015 LTIP are described further under **Long-Term Incentive Program** below.

We believe sustained performance against the combination of revenue and profitability financial goals represented in our executive incentive plans, as well as continued execution against our strategic goals, will create value for our shareholders over the long term. To further enhance the connection between payments under our LTIP and stock price appreciation, we have included relative total shareholder return (relative TSR), which is the percentage increase in stock price for the year plus dividends received, compared to the total shareholder return performance of a group of comparator companies, as a performance metric on our LTIP grants since 2016.

Compensation Best Practices. The committee regularly reviews our executive compensation programs to ensure they are designed to reflect market-based best practices, effectively support the achievement of our financial and strategic goals, and do not promote inappropriate risk taking. Our compensation practices include the following:

Programs and Policies:

Pay-for-performance: A significant portion of our executive compensation is tied to the achievement of financial goals under our short- and long-term incentive programs. Our long-term incentive plan also links executive compensation to stock price appreciation through stock option grants and as an element of our performance cash unit program.

Clawback policy: In 2013, the committee added a recoupment policy to our executive officer PIP applicable to plan awards paid to executive officers for performance periods beginning on or after December 30, 2013. Our officers participating in our LTIP also sign a Prohibited Activity Agreement allowing the clawback of certain stock option gains if the officer violates non-solicitation and non-competition provisions contained in the agreement.

Table of Contents

Anti-hedging and anti-pledging rules: Our Securities Trading Policy prohibits our employees from engaging in short sales of our stock (unless the sale is part of a permitted cashless exercise of stock options) and from trading in any form of derivative security or instrument linked to our stock. The policy also prohibits pledging of PerkinElmer common stock by our officers.

Stock ownership guidelines: Each of our executives and directors is expected to own shares of our common stock representing a significant aggregate fair market value to further align their interests with those of shareholders and encourage a long-term view of performance.

Elimination of Section 280G excise tax and gross-up payments: The committee eliminated Internal Revenue Code Section 280G excise tax and associated gross-up payments in employment agreements entered into with individuals hired or promoted to officer positions after July 2010.

Elimination of single-trigger equity vesting: Employment agreements entered into with individuals hired or promoted to officer positions after February 2010 provide that their equity awards will vest following a change in control only if the individual has a qualifying termination of employment within a specified period of time following the change in control.

No option repricing: Our 2009 Incentive Plan does not permit repricing of stock options without the consent of our shareholders.

Changes to benefit programs: The committee regularly reviews the market-alignment, effectiveness and costs associated with our executive benefit programs. On December 8, 2017, the committee approved the elimination of officer automobile and financial planning allowances, effective January 1, 2018.

Governance:

Independent compensation and benefits committee: Our committee is composed entirely of independent directors as defined under the rules of the NYSE.

Compensation advisor independence: The committee retains a third-party compensation consultant which it has reviewed for independence and found no conflicts of interest.

Annual evaluation of executive compensation: The committee evaluates our executive compensation programs annually to ensure they remain aligned with market practices and appropriately link pay with performance.

Compensation risk assessment: The committee monitors the design and implementation of our compensation programs to ensure they include appropriate elements to motivate employees to take a long-term

view of the business and do not encourage unnecessary risk taking.

Shareholder vote to approve executive compensation on an advisory basis: Our board has adopted annual frequency for holding shareholder advisory votes on our executive compensation program.

Our Named Executive Officers

Our 2017 named executive officers are as follows:

Robert F. Friel: Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and President

Frank A. Wilson: Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer

James Corbett: Executive Vice President and President, Discovery and Analytical Solutions

Joel S. Goldberg: Senior Vice President, Administration, General Counsel and Secretary

Prahlad R. Singh: Executive Vice President and President, Diagnostics

Table of Contents

2017 Shareholder Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation

Our board adopted the recommendation of our shareholders to hold annual shareholder advisory votes on our executive compensation program, consistent with the outcome of the shareholder votes on the frequency of such votes at the 2011 and 2017 annual meetings of shareholders. At our 2017 annual meeting of shareholders, we held our annual shareholder advisory vote on the compensation of our named executive officers, or say-on-pay vote, as required by Section 14A of the Exchange Act. At the meeting, 94% of the shareholder votes cast were in favor of our say-on-pay proposal.

In advance of the say-on-pay vote, our management extended invitations to discuss our 2017 proxy statement, including the compensation discussion and analysis and our executive compensation program, to each of our twenty-five largest investors at that time (ranked by percentage owned of shares outstanding) to solicit their feedback and answer their questions. We have proactively extended this invitation to our largest investors in each of the past seven years, and plan to continue to do so in the future.

Neither management nor the committee received feedback from our investors suggesting specific changes to our executive compensation program during fiscal 2017. The committee also observed that 94% of the shareholder votes cast on the say-on-pay proposal at our 2017 annual meeting of shareholders were in support of our executive compensation program. Accordingly, the committee did not implement material changes to the executive compensation program in fiscal year 2017 in response to the shareholder say-on-pay vote. The committee will continue to carefully consider feedback from shareholders and we will continue to proactively solicit feedback from investors. The committee also annually engages its independent compensation consultant to present an overview of executive compensation trends that may be important to investors. The committee's consideration of feedback from shareholders, along with market information and analysis provided by the independent compensation consultant, have influenced a number of changes to our executive compensation program over the past several years. These changes include the elimination from employment agreements with newly hired and newly promoted executive officers of both single-trigger equity vesting following a change of control and Section 280G tax gross-up payments, and increases to our executive stock ownership guidelines. The committee will also continue to design our executive compensation program guided by our executive compensation philosophy and core principles as described below.

Oversight of the Executive Compensation Program

The compensation and benefits committee directs the design and oversees the operation of our executive compensation program. A description of the committee's structure, roles and responsibilities can be found above under the heading Board of Directors Meetings and Committees.

The compensation and benefits committee has the authority under its charter to directly retain, review fees for, and terminate advisors and consultants as it deems necessary to assist in the fulfillment of its responsibilities. The committee has retained an independent compensation consultant (the compensation consultant) who provides data and analyses that serve as the basis for setting executive officer and director compensation levels, and advises the committee on compensation decisions. The compensation consultant also advises the committee on the structure of executive officer and director compensation programs, including the design of incentive plans, the forms and mix of compensation, regulatory requirements and other topics relevant to executive and board compensation. During fiscal year 2017, the committee retained Frederic W. Cook & Co., Inc., or F.W. Cook, as its compensation consultant.

In connection with its engagement of F.W. Cook, the committee reviewed the independence of F.W. Cook as a compensation consultant pursuant to SEC rules and concluded that no conflict of interest existed that would affect F.W. Cook's independence. F.W. Cook does not provide services to our management. F.W. Cook provided

compensation consulting and analyses that were considered in the committee's decisions regarding executive compensation for fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018.

28 [PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement](#)

Table of Contents

The committee has adopted protocols governing if and when its compensation consultant's advice and recommendations to the committee can be shared with management, recognizing that, in advising the committee, it is necessary for the compensation consultant to interact with management to gather information. The committee also determines the appropriate forum for receiving recommendations from its compensation consultant. Where appropriate, the committee invites management to provide context for the recommendations. In other cases, the committee receives the compensation consultant's recommendations in executive session where management is not present. The committee also engages directly with its compensation consultant between meetings, as deemed necessary by the committee. This approach further protects the committee's ability to receive objective advice from the compensation consultant and establishes a forum for independent decisions about executive pay.

The agenda for meetings of the compensation and benefits committee is proposed by the Chair of the committee with assistance from our Chief Executive Officer and other members of management. Agenda topics are also proposed by committee members. At the invitation of the Chair of the committee, compensation and benefits committee meetings held in fiscal year 2017 were regularly attended by our Chief Executive Officer, our Senior Vice President, Chief Human Resources Officer, our Senior Vice President, Administration, General Counsel and Secretary, as well as the committee's compensation consultant. For part of each meeting, the committee meets in executive session without the Chief Executive Officer and other members of management present. The committee's compensation consultant attends executive sessions as requested by the committee. The committee's Chair regularly reports the committee's recommendations and decisions on executive compensation to our board. Our Chief Executive Officer and other executive officers may be authorized by the committee to fulfill certain administrative duties regarding compensation and benefit programs.

Executive Compensation Philosophy and Core Principles: Overview

We apply the following compensation philosophy in structuring the compensation of our executive officers, including the named executive officers. We believe that pay should be performance-based, vary with the attainment of specific objectives, and be closely aligned with the interests of our shareholders. To implement this philosophy, the committee, working with management and the committee's compensation consultant, has established core principles to guide the design and operation of our compensation program. We aim to:

provide market-competitive compensation to attract and retain executive talent with the capability to lead within a global company,

emphasize variable pay to align executive compensation with the achievement of results that drive PerkinElmer's business strategy,

use equity-based incentive plans to tie a significant portion of compensation to PerkinElmer's long-term results and align the executive's financial interests with those of our shareholders,

deliver compensation in the aggregate that is commensurate with PerkinElmer's results,

design executive compensation programs that are affordable for the Company, including their impact on earnings,

design executive incentive plans that do not promote inappropriate or excessive risk taking,

promote executive ownership of PerkinElmer stock to further align executives' financial interests with shareholders' interests and to facilitate an ownership culture among executives,

be flexible to respond to changing needs of the business,

consider shareholder feedback, and

be transparent, so that both executives and other stakeholders understand the executive compensation program and the objectives it seeks to achieve.

Table of Contents**Compensation Policies**

Market Positioning. The committee's policy is to manage total target compensation (and each element) to the median of the competitive market over time. Through the range of opportunities provided in our short- and long-term incentive programs (each discussed more fully below), actual payments may exceed the median when our performance exceeds PerkinElmer's targeted objectives, and may fall below the median when performance is below target. An individual named executive officer's total compensation (or an element) in any given year may be set above or below median, depending on experience, tenure, performance and internal equity.

External Market Practices. The committee annually reviews market compensation levels to determine whether total compensation for our executives remains in the targeted pay range, and makes adjustments when appropriate. This assessment includes evaluation of base salary, and short- and long-term incentive opportunities against a peer group of industry companies with whom we compete for executive talent and in other business matters, supplemented with industry-specific aggregated survey data for companies of comparable size to PerkinElmer, as measured by annual revenues. In general, the committee gives primary consideration to the peer group information because the peer companies resemble us more closely than the survey participants in terms of size and industry. The committee assesses the data by reviewing compensation arrangements for positions with comparable complexity and scope of responsibility to the positions at PerkinElmer. In addition, the committee assesses rewards such as health benefits, retirement programs and perquisites relative to the market. The committee considers external market data as a general indication of competitive market pay levels, and does not maintain a policy that executive officer pay must conform to a specific level relative to the market data.

Working with its compensation consultant, the committee reviews its peer group each year to ensure that the peer companies selected remain appropriate for compensation and performance comparison purposes. Companies are selected based on industry and size, reflected by both revenue and market capitalization. The committee's goal is to assemble a group of companies that represents our competitors for executive talent.

The peer companies used by the committee for pay comparisons and for evaluating relative performance leading to approval of 2017 and 2018 executive compensation are shown in the table below. FEI Company was acquired during fiscal 2016, however, compensation and company performance information for FEI Company was available for the review of 2017 executive compensation, which began in October 2016. As a result, FEI Company was retained in the peer group for the review of 2017 executive compensation, but was not included in the peer group for the review of 2018 executive compensation.

In July 2017, the committee reviewed information provided by its compensation consultant and approved changes to the peer group. Alere, Inc. was removed from the peer group due to its pending acquisition. Varian Medical Systems, Inc. was removed from the peer group due to its lack of industry alignment following the Company's divestiture of its Medical Imaging business. Based on its evaluation of the peer company selection criteria described above, the committee approved the addition of the following five companies to the peer group: Bio-Techne Corporation, IDEXX Laboratories, Mettler-Toledo, Myriad Genetics, Inc., and Teleflex, Inc.

Table of Contents

Company Name	Peer Group Used for Evaluation of 2017 NEO Compensation	Peer Group Used for Evaluation of 2018 NEO Compensation
Agilent Technologies, Inc.	X	X
Alere, Inc.	X	
Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.	X	X
Bio-Techne Corporation		X
Bruker Corporation	X	X
C.R. Bard, Inc.	X	X
FEI Company	X	
Hologic, Inc.	X	X
IDEX Corporation	X	X
IDEXX Laboratories		X
Mettler-Toledo		X
Myriad Genetics, Inc.		X
Roper Industries, Inc.	X	X
Teleflex, Inc.		X
Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.	X	X
Varian Medical Systems, Inc.	X	
VWR Corporation	X	X
Waters Corporation	X	X

Other Factors Influencing Compensation. When making compensation decisions, the committee takes many other factors into account, including the individual's performance against individual goals (particularly over the past year), the individual's expected future contributions to PerkinElmer's success, the financial and operational results of our business units and PerkinElmer as a whole, the individual's historical compensation and any retention concerns, and the Chief Executive Officer's recommendations (in the case of named executive officers other than the Chief Executive Officer). In looking at historical compensation, the committee looks at the progression of salary increases over time, and also looks at the unvested and vested value of outstanding equity awards. The committee uses the same factors in evaluating the Chief Executive Officer's performance and compensation that it uses for the other named executive officers.

Role of Chief Executive Officer. The Chief Executive Officer regularly attends a portion of each committee meeting. He provides the committee with his assessment of the performance of the other named executive officers and his perspective on the factors described above used to develop his recommendations for compensation. The committee discusses each named executive officer and the Chief Executive Officer's recommendations in detail, including how the recommendations compare against the external market data, and how the compensation levels of the executives compare to each other and to the Chief Executive Officer's. The committee approves or modifies the Chief Executive Officer's recommendations. Mr. Friel provided recommendations to the committee regarding 2017 executive compensation. The Chief Executive Officer does not make recommendations to the committee, or participate in committee decision-making, regarding his own compensation.

At the end of the fiscal year, our Chief Executive Officer's annual performance is evaluated by our full board against both his financial and non-financial goals, which are approved by the committee early in the fiscal year. In addition, he provides an assessment of his performance relative to the goals. The committee discusses the Chief Executive Officer's assessment as well as the committee members

Table of Contents

and all other board members' assessments of his performance in executive session. The Chief Executive Officer is not present during the executive session discussion of his performance. Working with its compensation consultant, the committee determines and approves the Chief Executive Officer's base salary, short-term incentive plan target and payment under the PIP (consistent with the terms of the plan described below), and long-term incentive program targets and awards (consistent with the terms of the plan described below). The committee's approval is then presented to the independent directors for ratification in executive session.

Pay Mix. In accordance with our pay-for-performance compensation philosophy and because the named executive officers are in a position to directly influence the overall performance of the Company, they have a significant portion of their target compensation at risk through short- and long-term incentive programs. Not including the cost of benefits, in 2017, our Chief Executive Officer had 86% of his target compensation at risk, and on average our other named executive officers had 74% of their target compensation at risk (that is, subject to either performance requirements and/or service requirements). Additionally, to align executive officer compensation with long-term corporate success, a significant percentage of the named executive officers' target compensation opportunity is delivered in the form of long-term incentive compensation through our LTIP. In 2017, 72% of our Chief Executive Officer's total target compensation opportunity and 55% of the other named executive officers' total target compensation opportunity on average were delivered through long-term incentive compensation based on the fair market value on the date of grant. Half (50%) of the long-term incentive compensation granted to our named executive officers in fiscal 2017 will vest solely based upon the achievement of financial performance metrics. Also, to align the interests of executive officers with shareholders and to support an ownership culture, three quarters of the named executive officers', including the Chief Executive Officer's, target long-term incentive compensation opportunity was provided using equity-based vehicles (stock options, restricted stock, and performance RSUs).

2017 Target Total Compensation

The committee has determined that our Chief Executive Officer should have a higher percentage of his total target compensation delivered in the form of performance-based incentives than the other named executive officers, due to his impact on, and higher accountability for, Company performance. Market and peer company information presented to the committee as part of the annual executive compensation program review supports that this is a competitive practice.

We expect to continue to deliver the majority of our target executive compensation through performance-based incentive programs, although the committee reserves the right to vary the pay mix by individual. The pay mix may also change annually, based on the committee's evaluation of

Table of Contents

competitive external market practices and its determination of how to best align our executive incentive compensation programs with achievement of our business goals.

Pay for Results. We have a strong culture of paying for results. This is evidenced by the significant percentage of our executive compensation package tied to short- or long-term performance. In evaluating results against performance metrics and associated achievement, the committee looked primarily at overall corporate financial metrics as an indicator of business performance. For 2017, the primary metrics on our PIP were organic revenue growth and adjusted earnings per share. The primary metrics on our 2017 LTIP were adjusted revenue growth and adjusted gross margin expansion. Our 2016 and 2017 LTIP programs also include relative total shareholder return (relative TSR) as a performance metric. The committee selected these metrics to capture the most important aspects of financial performance in the form of revenue growth, profitability and shareholder return. Revenue growth is a reflection of the growth of our core businesses and expansion through acquisitions. Profitability provides us with the means to invest in both product and service innovation as well as business development opportunities that fuel revenue growth. We believe that the combination of strong top- and bottom-line financial performance creates shareholder value growth that is sustainable over the long term. Relative TSR was added to the LTIP in order to reward the creation of shareholder value as measured by stock price performance relative to an industry index. In establishing performance objectives, the committee also reviews the performance of our industry peer group, referring to companies which are the best comparators for each of our businesses, and setting performance goals within the context of our strategic business plan. More information about the performance metrics and the goals for our short- and long-term incentive programs is provided below.

Components of the Executive Officer Compensation Program

For 2017, our executive officer compensation program consisted of base salary, our long-term incentive program or LTIP (comprising stock options, restricted stock, performance cash units and performance RSUs), our short-term incentive program, and benefits and other perquisites. The table below describes how these elements of compensation link to our compensation philosophy core principles:

Core Principles	Base Salary	Long-Term	Short-Term	Other Benefits and Perquisites
		Incentive Program (LTIP)	Incentive Program (PIP Bonus)	
Attract and retain executive talent	X	X	X	X
Variable pay aligns compensation with the achievement of results		X	X	
Equity-based incentive plans tie compensation to long-term results		X		
Deliver compensation commensurate with PerkinElmer's results		X	X	
Affordability	X	X	X	X
Aligned with market	X	X	X	X

Executive incentive plans that do not promote inappropriate or excessive risk taking		X		X	
Promote executive ownership of PerkinElmer stock		X			
Programs that respond to changing needs of the business		X		X	
Transparency	X	X		X	X

Table of Contents

In 2017, the committee reviewed all compensation, benefits and perquisites provided to the named executive officers. The specific rationale, design, reward process, and related information for each element are outlined below.

Base Salary

Base salary levels for executive officers are determined based on the committee's evaluation of the executive's position, experience and performance, and competitive external market data (which includes peer group information as described under "Compensation Policies External Market Practices" above). Generally, the committee refers to the median of the relevant competitive market for the position as part of the base salary evaluation, but any individual named executive officer may have a base salary above or below the median of the market. The committee's philosophy is that base salaries should meet the objective of attracting and retaining the executive talent needed to run a complex business. In determining individual base salaries, the committee places specific emphasis on the scope and impact of the executive officer's role in the organization, particularly if the executive has assumed more significant responsibilities or has been promoted to a new position. The committee also considers the value the executive has delivered and is expected to continue to deliver to the organization through performance of his or her job responsibilities and the achievement of individual performance goals. The committee evaluates external market data for each position and internal pay equity, as well.

Base salary adjustments can affect the value of other compensation and benefit elements. As the value of the short-term incentive award is expressed as a multiple of base salary, a higher base salary will result in a higher short-term incentive award, assuming the same level of achievement against goals. Additionally, as the committee establishes target total long-term incentive award opportunities for each of the named executive officers expressed as a percentage of base salary, a higher base salary will result in a higher long-term incentive target award opportunity. Certain benefits and programs, such as life insurance and severance, are also based on a multiple of base salary.

The salaries paid to our named executive officers in 2017 are shown in the Summary Compensation Table that follows this report. Working with F.W. Cook in late 2016 and early 2017, the committee reviewed the total target compensation package for each officer in order to determine and approve the target compensation package for each officer for 2017. The analysis included a review of market peer company and survey data for comparable positions as well as consideration of the individual factors noted above. The F.W. Cook analysis presented to the committee in late 2016 that the committee used to evaluate total target compensation for 2017 reported that base salaries for our named executive officers in 2016 were generally competitive with market levels in aggregate. On an individual level, the base salaries paid to each of our executive officers in 2016 were positioned within 11 percentage points above or below the 50th percentile for their respective job matches at the peer companies. Compensation for each executive officer was also reviewed in light of internal equity, the scope and impact of the position to the Company, and the performance of each individual in his respective role.

Based on the factors described above, including performance and the analysis of market information presented by F.W. Cook in October 2016, the committee approved base salary increases to our named executive officers effective April 10, 2017 as follows: Mr. Wilson's base salary increased 2.6% to \$543,000; Mr. Goldberg's base salary increased 2.6% to \$463,700; and Mr. Singh's base salary increased 8% to \$475,000. Messrs. Friel's and Corbett's salaries did not change during fiscal 2017.

Long-Term Incentive Program (LTIP)

The committee uses long-term incentive awards to focus our executive officers on long-term performance and to align the executive officers' financial interests with those of our shareholders. Our long-term incentive program for executive officers, referred to as LTIP, comprises stock options, restricted stock and performance restricted stock units

(PRSUs) and performance cash units. For the

34 PerkinElmer *2018 Proxy Statement*

Table of Contents

named executive officers participating in LTIP in 2017, approximately one-quarter of the long-term incentive opportunity was provided in the form of non-qualified stock options, approximately one-quarter in restricted stock, approximately one-quarter in PRSUs, and approximately one-quarter in the form of performance cash units. The committee believes this approach to long-term incentive compensation builds upon its pay-for-performance philosophy and provides a balanced focus on stock price appreciation and the achievement of financial metrics that are drivers of long-term shareholder value creation.

In structuring LTIP, the committee believes it is important to retain stock options as a significant element of the program to continue to capture the motivational benefits of rewarding executives for appreciation in our stock price over the course of multiple years. The restricted share element of LTIP also provides motivation and reward for stock price appreciation and supports retention through a three-year cliff vesting schedule. The cash-based performance unit and performance RSU portions of LTIP further align the long-term incentive program with important drivers of long-term shareholder value, as vesting and payments are based on achievement of key financial performance goals during the three-year period.

LTIP targets and grant components

Long-term incentive awards are granted annually. For 2017, the committee established target total long-term incentive award opportunities for each of the named executive officers based on the executive's position, experience, performance and market competitive long-term incentive levels, with median award values from our 2016 compensation evaluation peer group used as the reference point. These targets were expressed as a percentage of the named executive officers' base salaries, and ranged from one-and-a-half to five-times annual base salary. In all cases, 2017 target opportunity values were set at levels the committee believed would compensate the executives for future achievement of our long-term financial goals and stock price appreciation in a manner commensurate with the executives' duties and contributions.

The committee utilized peer and survey data presented by F.W. Cook in October 2016 as a reference point for setting target award opportunities for our named executive officers in 2017. The committee approved an LTIP target opportunity of 500% of base salary for Mr. Friel, which approximated the 46th percentile for other Chief Executive Officer positions in the peer group and represented no change from his target opportunity for 2016. As of the end of fiscal 2016, LTIP opportunities for the other named executive officers ranged from 150% to 250% of base salary, which fell from below the 25th to the 55th percentile of LTIP target opportunities for comparable positions in the peer group. Based on their review of the F.W. Cook analysis, internal equity, and the scope and impact of their roles, the committee approved 2017 LTIP target opportunities as a multiple of base salary for the remaining named executive officers as follows: Mr. Wilson: 225%; Mr. Goldberg: 225%; Mr. Corbett: 250%; and Mr. Singh: 150%.

Descriptions of the four components of LTIP are as follows:

Stock Options: The number of option shares to be granted to an LTIP participant is determined by dividing the award value associated with stock options by the Black-Scholes value of the option. Stock options are issued with an exercise price at fair market value on the date of grant to ensure executives will receive a benefit only when the stock price increases. For more information about our equity grant practices, please see [Additional Compensation Policies Equity Award Granting Practices](#) below. Stock options granted under LTIP vest one-third on the first anniversary of grant, one-third on the second anniversary of grant, and the remaining one-third on the third anniversary of grant. The options expire in seven years, or earlier in the case of termination of employment. Retaining key talent is an important objective for the committee in establishing the vesting schedule. We believe the three-year vesting schedule appropriately balances the retention aspect of stock options and timing of the potential value delivery to the individual.

Table of Contents

Restricted Stock: The number of shares of restricted stock to be granted to an LTIP participant is determined by dividing the award value associated with restricted stock by the closing stock price on the date of grant. Restricted shares granted under LTIP vest 100% on the third anniversary of the date of grant. The committee grants restricted shares with a time-based vesting schedule to enhance the retention value of LTIP, and to provide motivation to drive stock price growth. If the officer voluntarily terminates employment before the vesting date, the shares are forfeited.

Performance Cash Units: The number of performance cash units to be granted to an LTIP participant is determined by dividing the award value associated with performance cash units by the closing stock price on the date of grant. The performance cash unit program provides cash award opportunities based on sustained operational excellence. The cash award is paid at the end of the three-year performance period based on the achievement of financial measures and reflects stock price growth. The cash units earned under the award are determined by multiplying the number of cash units granted to an officer by a performance factor, ranging from 0% to 200%, determined by performance of the Company against pre-established financial goals. Performance cash unit achievement under our 2017 LTIP may be further modified upward or downward 20% based on relative TSR performance. Earned units are paid in cash and are determined by multiplying the number of cash units earned by PerkinElmer's stock price at the end of the three-year period.

Performance Restricted Stock Units (PRsUs): The number of PRsUs to be granted to an LTIP participant is determined by dividing the award value associated with the PRsU by the closing stock price on the date of grant. PRsUs vest at the end of the three-year performance period based on the achievement of financial measures. The number of PRsUs earned under the award is determined by multiplying the number of PRsUs granted to an officer by a performance factor, ranging from 0% to 200%, determined by performance of the Company against pre-established financial goals. Performance RSU achievement under our 2017 LTIP may be further modified upward or downward 20% based on relative TSR performance. Each vested PRsU results in the delivery of one share of PerkinElmer, Inc. common stock.

At the end of the three-year performance period the Company must achieve aggressive financial goals previously approved by the committee, in order for the performance cash units and PRsUs to vest. The committee assigns minimum, target and maximum goals for each performance factor. If the minimum goal is not met, no cash payment or share delivery, as applicable, will be made for that performance factor. Performance goals are set based on our extended business projections and provide an incentive for strong and competitive revenue and earnings growth. Evaluation of achievement against goals, and any resulting payment for performance cash units and PRsUs granted, is conducted at the end of the three-year performance period. Goal measurement may be adjusted for certain events including acquisitions, divestitures, currency fluctuations, and other non-recurring events as approved by the committee.

Over the past three years, performance unit goal achievement has ranged from 63% to 127% of target. This range of achievement reflects the setting of aggressive long-term performance targets.

Our employment agreements with our named executive officers provide for acceleration of vesting in certain situations, such as upon, or following, a change in control of PerkinElmer. Please see Employment Agreements and Severance/Change in Control Arrangements, and Potential Payments upon Termination or Change in Control, below, for descriptions of equity and performance cash unit treatment for our named executive officers upon termination of employment.

Table of Contents

LTIP Structure: The committee grants LTIP awards to our executive officers annually, with each LTIP cycle spanning a three-year period. As a result, we have three active LTIP cycles during each fiscal year. The chart below summarizes the structure of our 2015, 2016 and 2017 LTIP grants, which were outstanding during fiscal year 2017.

2015 and 2016 LTIP Structure

Plan Component	Vesting	Description
Stock Options	Time-based	Vest 1/3rd annually on anniversary of grant date
Restricted Shares	Time-based	Vest 100% on the third anniversary of grant date
Performance Units	Performance-based	Vest at the end of the three-year LTIP cycle based on financial goal achievement

LTIP performance in fiscal year 2017

2015 LTIP: In January 2015, the committee approved the 2015 LTIP. The committee approved performance targets for the performance units for the entire three-year performance period at grant. The performance units were to vest based on performance against adjusted revenue growth (50% weighting) and adjusted earnings per share (EPS) growth (50% weighting) goals. The committee determined that giving these metrics equal weighting provided an appropriate balance between long-term top-line revenue growth and profitability.

Performance against the financial goals set for the performance units granted under the 2015 LTIP was evaluated at the end of fiscal year 2017. Three-year average adjusted revenue growth of 6.15% exceeded the minimum goal of 6% and resulted in performance achievement of 54%. Average adjusted EPS growth of 15.9% exceeded the maximum goal of 15%, resulting in performance achievement of 200%. Three-year average adjusted revenue growth and three-year adjusted EPS growth are calculated on a constant currency basis and adjusted for divestitures as approved by the committee. The achievement percentages were weighted 50% each and resulted in overall achievement of 127%. The committee approved vesting of the 2015 LTIP performance units at the 127% performance level that was achieved.

2015 LTIP Performance Unit Goals and Achievement

Metric	Weighting	Goals (Achievement %)			Result	Achievement %
		Minimum (50%)	Target (100%)	Maximum (200%)		
Adjusted Revenue Growth*	50%	6%	8%	10%	6.15%	54%
Adjusted EPS Growth*	50%	10%	12%	15%	15.9%	200%
Overall Achievement:						127%

* *Simple average growth over the three-year performance period*

We believe sustained performance against revenue and profitability goals will create value for our shareholders over the long term. From the date of the 2015 LTIP grant, our stock price increased 56% to a closing price of \$73.12 at the end of calendar year 2017. The committee determined that the performance unit vesting and payments were aligned with financial performance during the three-year 2015 LTIP performance period.

Table of Contents

The achievement described above resulted in vesting of performance units under the 2015 LTIP as follows:

2015 LTIP: Performance Unit Payment

Named Executive Officer	Number of Performance Units Granted	Achievement Against Financial Goals	Number of Units Earned	Year-End 2017 Stock Price	Total Performance Unit Payment
Robert F. Friel	36,835	127%	46,780	\$ 73.12	\$ 3,420,554
Frank A. Wilson	8,248	127%	10,475	\$ 73.12	\$ 765,932
James Corbett	6,264	127%	7,955	\$ 73.12	\$ 581,670
Joel S. Goldberg	6,264	127%	7,955	\$ 73.12	\$ 581,670

The vested units were multiplied by the \$73.12 period-end stock price and the resulting cash payment was made to our named executive officers in early 2018. Mr. Singh did not participate in the 2015 LTIP because the grant preceded his promotion to executive officer.

2016 LTIP:

In January 2016, the committee approved the 2016 LTIP which is similar in structure to the 2015 LTIP, comprising stock options with three-year annual vesting, restricted shares which vest 100% at the end of three years, and performance units which vest based on performance against three-year financial goals. The committee approved adjusted revenue growth (40% weighting), adjusted gross margin expansion (40% weighting), and relative total shareholder return (20% weighting) goals for the 2016 LTIP performance unit program. Adjusted gross margin expansion is the three-year improvement in GAAP gross margin adjusted for the impact of items related to purchase accounting, intangibles amortization, mark to market on post-retirement benefits, significant foreign currency movements and certain other items. The adjusted revenue and adjusted gross margin growth goals reflect our continued focus on long-term profitable growth. The relative total shareholder return performance metric is designed to reward the creation of shareholder value as measured by stock price performance relative to an industry index. Performance against the financial goals set for the performance units granted under the 2016 LTIP will be evaluated at the end of fiscal year 2018. Mr. Singh did not participate in our 2016 LTIP because the grant took place prior to his promotion to executive officer status.

2017 LTIP Structure

Plan Component	Vesting	Description
Stock Options	Time-based	Vest 1/3rd annually on anniversary of grant date
Restricted Shares	Time-based	Vest 100% on the third anniversary of grant date
Performance Cash Units	Performance-based	Vest at the end of the three-year LTIP cycle based on financial goal achievement
RSUs		

2017 LTIP

In January 2017, the committee approved the 2017 LTIP, adding performance restricted stock units (PRSUs) as a component of the program. The 2017 LTIP grant value was equally allocated to each of the following components: stock options with three-year annual vesting, restricted shares which vest 100% at the end of three years, performance cash units, and PRSUs. This results in an LTIP program for which half (50%) of the awards vest contingent upon achievement of performance goals.

Table of Contents

The performance cash units and the PRSUs will vest based on performance against a shared set of three-year financial goals. The 2017 LTIP performance goals are adjusted revenue growth (60% weighting) and adjusted gross margin expansion (40% weighting). Achievement against a relative TSR goal will be applied as a modifier (upward or downward) to determine the final number of units that will vest. The adjusted revenue and adjusted gross margin growth goals and weightings reflect our continued focus on long-term profitable growth. The relative total shareholder return performance metric is designed to reward the creation of shareholder value as measured by stock price performance relative to an industry index. Performance against the financial goals set for the performance units granted under the 2017 LTIP will be evaluated at the end of fiscal year 2019.

In January 2017, the committee also approved the addition of a performance goal to the 2017 LTIP restricted stock grant in order to qualify the grant for tax deductibility (the 162(m) arrangement). Both the performance goal, as well as the time vesting requirement, must be met in order for the shares to vest.

The committee approved achievement of a 2017 adjusted EBITDA (earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization) goal as the performance goal under the 162(m) arrangement that must be achieved in order for the restricted shares under the 2017 LTIP to vest. The committee selected adjusted EBITDA as the performance goal because it is a key measure of profitability. Fiscal 2017 adjusted EBITDA performance of \$482 million exceeded the \$200 million adjusted EBITDA goal approved by the committee. Satisfaction of the 2017 adjusted EBITDA goal met the performance goal requirement but did not result in vesting of the 2017 LTIP restricted shares because they are still subject to the time-based vesting requirement. The restricted shares granted under our 2017 LTIP are scheduled to vest on the third anniversary of the grant date.

In addition to his 2017 LTIP award, the committee also approved a grant of 3,796 restricted shares and 15,559 stock options to Mr. Singh which were granted on February 7, 2017. The restricted shares and stock options will fully vest on the third anniversary of the date of grant. The committee approved this grant following an evaluation that included market analysis provided by F.W. Cook and consideration of other relevant factors including the organizational importance of Mr. Singh's role.

The committee approved grants for our named executive officers during fiscal 2017 are reported in the 2017 Grants of Plan-Based Awards table of this proxy statement.

2018 LTIP

In January 2018, the committee approved the 2018 LTIP which is similar in structure to the 2017 LTIP, comprising stock options with three-year annual vesting, restricted shares which vest 100% at the end of three years, and performance cash units and PRSUS which vest based on performance against three-year financial goals. Performance against the financial goals set for the performance cash units and PRSUs granted under the 2018 LTIP will be evaluated at the end of fiscal year 2020.

Short-Term Incentive Program

The Performance Incentive Plan, or PIP, is our short-term incentive program and is a core component of our pay-for-performance executive compensation program. The program components include the award opportunity (expressed as a percentage of base salary), the performance measures (such as adjusted earnings per share) and their weightings, and the performance goals (such as a particular earnings target).

Award opportunities

The committee establishes the target award opportunity for each named executive officer based on competitive market analysis (target PIP opportunities are generally positioned within a reasonable range of the median of the competitive market), the desired emphasis on pay at risk (more pay at risk for more senior executives) and internal equity (comparably positioned executives should have

Table of Contents

comparable award opportunities). Positioning target PIP opportunities generally at the market median underscores the committee's compensation strategy that compensation levels should approximate market median levels when performance meets target expectations, and that pay should exceed median levels only when performance exceeds PerkinElmer's targeted objectives. The 2017 target PIP award opportunity for each named executive officer was as follows:

Named Executive Officer	Annual PIP Target Award Opportunity Expressed as % of Base Salary
Robert F. Friel	100%
Frank A. Wilson	70%
James Corbett	75%
Joel S. Goldberg	70%
Prahlad R. Singh	70%

Performance measures, weightings and goals

In 2017, the committee approved a single PIP performance period for our named executive officers for the full fiscal year.

Annual PIP bonus awards are granted under our 2009 Incentive Plan, which was approved by shareholders at our 2009 annual meeting of shareholders and reapproved by shareholders at our 2014 annual meeting of shareholders. Granting PIP bonus awards under the 2009 Incentive Plan is intended to preserve the tax deductibility of the PIP bonuses that may be earned by our executive officers under Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code as in effect for 2017 (the 162(m) arrangement). The committee approves an overall company performance goal for the applicable fiscal year, the satisfaction of which authorizes payments under the PIP of up to a maximum amount specified by the committee. If the company performance goal is not satisfied, no payments under the PIP for the fiscal year are permitted. If the company performance goal is satisfied, payment under the PIP of up to the maximum amount may be authorized, however, the committee retains the right to exercise downward discretion to reduce the amounts of the payments ultimately made under the PIP.

In connection with approving the overall company performance goal for the applicable fiscal year, the committee also approves supplemental financial and strategic goals for the year. If the overall company performance goal for the year is satisfied, the committee evaluates performance against the supplemental financial and strategic goals in determining the degree of downward discretion to exercise with respect to the PIP bonus payments ultimately made to each named executive officer. The PIP imposes no limits on the level of downward discretion the committee may apply.

At the committee meeting held in January 2017, the committee approved achievement of adjusted EBITDA (earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization) of \$200 million as the overall company performance goal under the 162(m) arrangement that must be achieved in order for any PIP payment to be made to our executive officers for fiscal 2017. Adjusted EBITDA is defined as EBITDA adjusted for the impact of items related to acquisitions, business repositioning, mark to market on post-retirement benefits, stock-based compensation, and other certain items. The committee selected adjusted EBITDA as the performance goal because it is a key measure of profitability. For fiscal 2017, upon achievement of the adjusted EBITDA goal, the PIP bonus achievement could be funded up to 250% of target for Messrs. Friel, Wilson and Goldberg and up to 300% for Messrs. Corbett and Singh.

Fiscal 2017 adjusted EBITDA performance of \$482 million exceeded the \$200 million adjusted EBITDA goal approved by the committee. The committee applied negative discretion to the PIP bonuses approved for each of our named executive officers, lowering the awards to amounts commensurate with performance against the supplemental financial and strategic goals as described below.

40 PerkinElmer *2018 Proxy Statement*

Table of Contents

At the committee meeting held in January 2017, the committee also established the supplemental PIP financial and strategic performance goals for fiscal 2017. The performance goals were based on the fiscal 2017 operating plan, budget and strategic plan reviewed by our board of directors. The committee set financial goals for overall corporate performance and for our Discovery and Analytical Solutions and our Diagnostics strategic business units.

The supplemental performance metrics and weightings for the fiscal 2017 PIP were as follows:

	2017 PIP Metrics and Weightings	
	Organic Revenue Growth	Adjusted EPS / Adjusted Operating Profit
Corporate	60%	40%
Discovery and Analytical Solutions	60%	40%
Diagnostics	60%	40%

The committee assigned a weighting of 60% to organic revenue growth in reflection of our focus on growing our core businesses. The inclusion of adjusted EPS and strategic business unit adjusted operating profit were designed to focus our management team on both growing revenue and operating a profitable business, which are critical to creating shareholder value.

The supplemental performance metrics for Messrs. Friel, Wilson and Goldberg consisted entirely of the overall corporate financial performance metrics in recognition of their responsibility for financial results at the corporate level. The supplemental performance metrics for Messrs. Corbett and Singh were allocated across the overall corporate financial performance metrics with a weighting of 20% and the financial performance metrics for their respective strategic business units with a weighting of 80%. The combination of financial metrics and weightings for Messrs. Corbett and Singh emphasize their responsibility for the results of their respective strategic business units while also recognizing their contribution to results at the corporate level. Performance against goals may be adjusted for certain events including acquisitions, divestitures, currency exchange, and other non-recurring events during the performance period as approved by the committee. The definition of allowable adjustments is approved by the committee at the time the goals are set.

In an effort to ensure the integrity of these goals and minimize the risk of unanticipated outcomes, each financial metric has a target goal with a performance range built around it, with a commensurate increase or decrease in the associated award opportunity. The range of performance goals and associated award opportunities under the program is expressed in the form of a minimum, target and maximum. If results fall below the minimum goal, the short-term incentive amount associated with that goal is not paid. If results exceed pre-established maximum goals, the cash award payout associated with financial performance is capped at the maximum award opportunity. The committee believes that a maximum cap reduces the likelihood of windfalls and makes the maximum cost of the plan predictable. For 2017, achievement of the minimum level of performance for each financial metric would result in achievement of 50% of the target award associated with that financial metric, and achievement of the maximum level of performance for each financial metric would result in achievement of the following percentage of the target award associated with that metric: corporate organic revenue growth: 200%; strategic business unit organic revenue growth: 300%; adjusted EPS: 125%; and strategic business unit adjusted operating profit: 150%. The committee approved the higher maximum achievement levels for the organic revenue growth metrics, and lower maximums for over-achievement of the profitability goals, to create greater award opportunities associated with organic revenue growth.

The range of performance goals for each financial metric is set primarily based on our annual operating plan and our business expectations for the year. External performance expectations are also considered. The goals for minimum

level payments are set to reasonable performance levels and result in only partial bonus payment. Target awards reflect our business plan goals for the period. Maximum awards are paid based on aggressive goals which can be attained only when business results are exceptional.

Table of Contents

At the January 2017 meeting, the committee also established strategic goals in the areas of creating breakthrough solutions, focusing on customers and advancing our talent and operations, the achievement of which would also be considered in the determination of fiscal 2017 PIP bonuses paid to executive officers.

2017 short-term incentive payments

Performance against supplemental PIP goals. We demonstrated solid performance against our financial goals in fiscal year 2017. Organic revenue growth and profitability performance in fiscal 2017 resulted in above-target achievement against the PIP financial goals.

The 2017 PIP target goals, actual results and associated PIP achievement levels are shown below. Results were adjusted by allowable items as approved by the committee, including currency fluctuation. The corporate organic revenue growth target goal was met and the adjusted EPS target was exceeded, resulting in overall achievement against the corporate goals of 108%.

2017 Supplemental PIP Goals and Achievement - Corporate

	Organic Revenue Growth			Adjusted EPS			Overall Achievement %
	60% Weighting Achievement			40% Weighting Achievement			
	Target	Result	%	Target	Result	%	
Corporate	4.0%	4.0%	100%	\$ 2.74	\$ 2.78	120%	108%

Organic revenue growth for the Discovery and Analytical Solutions business exceeded target and adjusted operating profit fell below the minimum threshold, resulting in overall achievement against the Discovery and Analytical Solutions goals of 102%. Organic revenue growth for the Diagnostics business exceeded the minimum threshold but did not meet target, and adjusted operating profit exceeded the target goal, resulting in overall achievement against the Diagnostics goals of 102%.

The PIP financial goal achievement for Messrs. Friel, Wilson and Goldberg was based entirely on the corporate achievement level of 108%. For Messrs. Corbett and Singh, the overall achievement against PIP financial metrics for their respective strategic business units was weighted 80%, and the achievement against the corporate metrics was weighted 20%, resulting in 2017 PIP financial goal achievement of 103% for both Mr. Corbett and Mr. Singh.

Each of our named executive officers was also assigned three to four strategic goals for 2017, which were reviewed and approved by the committee in January 2017. The strategic goals were objective and measurable, and were designed to create individual accountability for the achievement of strategic and operational business results during fiscal 2017. Following the end of fiscal 2017, the committee evaluated the performance of each named executive officer against the assigned 2017 strategic goals. The performance against individual strategic goals was applied in the committee's determination of each named executive officer's 2017 PIP bonus payment.

During 2017, we advanced our mission to focus on innovating for a healthier world and positioned ourselves for future growth by expanding our product offerings, investing in innovation, and enhancing our organizational responsiveness to the needs of our customers. Key achievements included:

We acquired Tulip and EUROIMMUN, expanding the scale and scope of our company, and positioning us to accelerate long-term growth while making an even greater impact on global health;

We completed the divestiture of our Medical Imaging business, resulting in a pre-tax book gain of \$180 million, enabling further focus and investment on our target markets;

We increased our R&D investment and launched innovative new solutions, including our whole genome sequencing service focused on inherited and rare diseases. We achieved \$189 million in revenue from new product introductions, an incremental increase of \$66 million over the prior fiscal year;

42 [PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement](#)

Table of Contents

We strengthened our organizational capabilities by completing the formation of our Discovery and Analytical Solutions business, which is strategically focused on opportunities in high-growth markets; and

We elevated our technological and operational capabilities and ended fiscal 2017 with an improved portfolio and wider geographic reach.

Based on its evaluation of achievement against the supplemental financial and strategic goals, the committee approved a 2017 PIP bonus payment to Mr. Friel of \$1,435,320. The committee approved 2017 PIP bonus payments to our other named executive officers as follows: Mr. Wilson: \$460,508; Mr. Corbett: \$440,870; Mr. Goldberg: \$502,557; and Mr. Singh: \$411,140. These payments ranged from 116% to 155% of each officer's target PIP bonus.

Over the past five years, individual executive officers have received PIP payments below the targeted payment level in five PIP performance periods. The average of the PIP payments made to our executive officers over the past five years is 112% of target, reflecting our financial performance over this time period. Individual payments ranged from a low of 27% to a high of 172% of target. The five-year period comprises seven performance periods because our PIP performance periods were semi-annual prior to fiscal 2015.

The short-term incentive payments to our named executive officers for 2017 are shown in the Summary Compensation Table that follows this report.

2018 short-term incentive plan name change

At the January 2018 meeting, the committee approved the re-naming of our short-term incentive plan to the Global Incentive Performance Plan (Global ICP), effective January 1, 2018.

Benefits

In addition to base salary, and short- and long-term incentive awards, our executive officers also participate in certain employee benefit programs. These benefit programs are designed to be competitive with market practices and to attract and retain the executive talent we need.

Retirement and Deferred Compensation Programs

Qualified 401(k) Plan and 401(k) Excess Benefit

All of our U.S. employees, including the named executive officers, are eligible to participate in our tax-qualified Section 401(k) plan which includes Company matching contributions.

Messrs. Friel, Wilson and Goldberg are eligible to receive a 401(k) Excess benefit. It is designed to provide only the benefit that the executive would have accrued under our tax-qualified plan if the IRS Code limits had not applied. It does not further enhance those benefits. Messrs. Corbett and Singh were not eligible to receive a 401(k) Excess benefit in 2017. The matching contributions for our 401(k) plan and contributions made under our 401(k) Excess benefit are included in the All Other Compensation column of the Summary Compensation Table and, in the case of the 401(k) Excess benefit, the Non-Qualified Deferred Compensation Plan Table (which also includes each named executive officer's account balance as of the end of fiscal year 2017).

Deferred Compensation Plan

In December 2010, due to low participation and high administrative costs, the committee amended our non-qualified deferred compensation plan to eliminate deferral elections from participants for plan years beginning January 1, 2011 or later. Prior to the amendment, a select group of highly compensated management employees was eligible to participate in the plan, including our named executive officers while employed by us and our directors who were serving on our board prior to the amendment. The 2008 Deferred Compensation Plan allowed participants to defer certain types

Table of Contents

of compensation and designate notional investments in a selection of mutual funds or PerkinElmer stock. Company contributions of 401(k) Excess benefits will continue to be made to this plan for eligible participants. The plan does not provide for above-market returns. For more information about the Deferred Compensation Plan, please refer to Non-Qualified Deferred Compensation Plan following the 2017 Non-Qualified Deferred Compensation Plan Table, below.

Qualified Defined Benefit Plans

In October 2010, the committee approved an amendment that ceased all remaining future accruals in the qualified defined benefit plan effective January 31, 2011. On January 31, 2001, the plan was closed to new employees, and employees of our former Life Sciences business ceased future accruals as of the same date. Future accruals ceased for our corporate office and what was then our Analytical Instruments business as of March 15, 2003. Mr. Friel is entitled to the benefit he accrued prior to March 15, 2003, which is shown in the Pension Benefits table. Messrs. Wilson, Corbett, Goldberg and Singh joined PerkinElmer after the plan was closed to new entrants.

Supplemental Executive Retirement Plan

Our Supplemental Executive Retirement Plan, or SERP, provides additional benefits to eligible executives employed as of June 30, 2000, after which it was closed to new entrants. Mr. Friel is the sole active participant in the SERP. Messrs. Wilson, Goldberg, Corbett, and Singh joined PerkinElmer after the plan was closed to new entrants, and therefore they are not eligible to accrue SERP benefits. Participants are eligible to receive the vested benefits they have accrued under the SERP upon retirement if they have completed five years of service and have reached 55 years of age while employed by PerkinElmer.

The change in the value of pension benefits in 2017 for Mr. Friel is described in footnote 6 to the Summary Compensation Table, and the full value of the SERP benefit at normal retirement age is shown in the Pension Benefits Table, below. In 2017, there was no amendment to the SERP.

Officer Programs

We provide a limited number of personal benefits to eligible officers which we believe are competitive with overall market practices and which the committee has determined are appropriate to offer to attract and retain key executives. The committee periodically reviews external market data to determine the types and value levels of programs we should provide. The committee also determines eligibility for officer programs. Messrs. Friel, Wilson and Goldberg are eligible for all of the programs described below. Messrs. Corbett and Singh are eligible for the executive physical benefit and the officer matching gift program.

Officer Matching Gift Program: The PerkinElmer Foundation will make matching gifts to the qualified institutions of the officer's choice up to an aggregate annual maximum of \$50,000 per year for the Chief Executive Officer and \$25,000 per year for other eligible officers. The program is provided in order to encourage our executives to support community and other not-for-profit organizations.

Executive Physical: Eligible officers may receive a full annual executive physical paid by the company. The physical is provided to encourage proactive management of health and well-being.

Executive Life and AD&D Insurance: Eligible officers are covered by an executive life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance plan that pays a death benefit equal to four times the executive's base salary. Officers eligible for executive life and AD&D coverage pay the associated tax on insurance premiums.

Automobile and Financial Planning Allowances: The committee ceased approving car and financial planning allowance benefits for officers promoted or hired after February 2010. In

Table of Contents

December 2017, the committee approved the elimination of car and financial planning allowances, effective January 1, 2018, for the executive officers who were still receiving these benefits under grandfathered arrangements. The committee approved this change based on its evaluation of competitive practices.

During fiscal 2017, Messrs. Friel, Wilson and Goldberg each received an automobile allowance, which was paid through our bi-weekly payroll as regular taxable income, in the following amounts: Mr. Friel: \$25,000; Mr. Wilson: \$17,498; and Mr. Goldberg: \$17,498. During fiscal 2017, Mr. Friel received a financial planning allowance of \$20,000, and Messrs. Wilson and Goldberg each received a financial planning allowance of \$12,000. The financial planning allowance was paid as regular taxable income. Beginning in fiscal 2018, Messrs. Friel, Wilson and Goldberg will no longer receive automobile or financial planning allowances.

Employment Agreements and Severance/Change in Control Arrangements

All of our named executive officers have employment agreements. The committee believes these agreements benefit PerkinElmer by clarifying the terms of employment and ensuring that we are protected by non-compete, non-solicitation, and non-disclosure provisions. We also believe these agreements are necessary for us to attract and retain senior talent in a competitive market. Furthermore, the committee believes that change in control benefits, if structured appropriately, serve to minimize the distraction caused by a potential transaction and reduce the risk that key talent will leave the organization before a transaction closes. These departures could reduce the value of the organization to a buyer or to the shareholders if a transaction fails to close.

The arrangements provide severance benefits to our named executive officers in the event of an involuntary termination not for cause, or voluntary termination following a change in control where the executive has good reason, as these terms are defined in the agreements. The benefits under the agreements are generally larger if the termination is associated with a change in control.

For Messrs. Friel, Wilson and Goldberg, all of whom were hired prior to certain changes approved by the committee that are described below, a tax gross-up is provided, if necessary, to make the executive whole for certain excise taxes imposed under the Internal Revenue Code. In addition, effective upon a change in control, 100% of the named executive officer's stock options, restricted shares and PSRUs would vest, and any granted performance units would be paid at the target level.

Following an evaluation of market practices, the committee determined on February 25, 2010 that future employment agreements issued to newly promoted or newly hired officers will provide 100% equity vesting upon termination following a change in control if the officer's employment is terminated within a specified period of time following the change in control. On July 30, 2010, the committee also determined that future employment agreements entered into with newly promoted or newly hired officers will not include a tax gross-up for excise taxes imposed under the Internal Revenue Code. Consistent with these decisions, the employment agreements issued to Messrs. Corbett and Singh do not include a tax gross-up for excise taxes imposed under the Internal Revenue Code, and their equity will vest following a change in control only for a qualifying termination of employment within a specified period of time following the change in control.

The committee periodically reviews the benefits provided under the agreements to ensure they serve PerkinElmer's interests in retaining key executives, are consistent with market practice, and are reasonable. Details of each named executive officer's agreement, and the estimated payments that each named executive officer would receive under different termination circumstances, are set forth below in Potential Payments upon Termination or Change in Control.

Table of Contents**Additional Compensation Policies*****Stock Ownership Guidelines***

The committee has determined that in order to further align management and shareholder interests, executive stock ownership should be significant relative to each executive officer's base salary. Executives are expected to attain these ownership levels within four years after their election or appointment. Ownership level determination includes stock acquired through the open market, through the exercise of stock options after which the shares are held, and shares granted under restricted stock grants. Shares held in our 401(k) and our deferred compensation plans are also counted. In October 2017, the committee approved the inclusion of vested, outstanding stock options toward the stock ownership level based on a review of competitive practice among our peer companies. Our stock ownership guidelines are expressed as the fair market value of the shares held as a multiple of annual base salary. The stock ownership guidelines for our executive officers (including our named executive officers) are as follows:

Officer Position	Stock Ownership Guidelines
Chief Executive Officer:	5 times annual base salary
Executive and Senior Vice President:	2 times annual base salary
Vice President:	1 times annual base salary

As of February 15, 2018, all of our actively employed named executive officers were in compliance with the stock ownership guidelines.

Securities Trading Policy

All trading in PerkinElmer securities by our named executive officers must be conducted under pre-established 10b5-1 trading plans. These 10b5-1 plans are subject to Company approval, can be entered into or amended only during open trading windows, impose a waiting period between adoption of a plan and initiation of trades, and have a maximum duration of one year. All trading in our securities by our directors requires pre-clearance from the office of our general counsel. Our Securities Trading Policy prohibits all employees, including our named executive officers, from engaging in short sales of our stock (unless the sale is part of a permitted cashless exercise of stock options) and from trading in any form of derivative security or instrument linked to our stock. The policy also prohibits pledging of PerkinElmer stock by our officers.

Clawback Policies

Our executive officer Performance Incentive Plan includes a recoupment provision applicable to all plan awards paid to executive officers for performance periods beginning on or after December 30, 2013. In the event we are required to prepare an accounting restatement due to material noncompliance with any financial reporting requirement under United States federal securities laws, the committee will have the right to recover all or a portion of the excess paid to the executive officer over the award payment that would have been paid to the executive officer under the accounting restatement. The recoupment provision applies to awards paid to current and former executive officers within the three-year period preceding the date on which we file an accounting restatement with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The committee, in its sole discretion, will make the determination whether to recover all or a portion of any excess award payment.

Officers, including our named executive officers, who are granted stock options under the LTIP, sign a Prohibited Activity Agreement. This agreement requires the officer to repay gains on stock options exercised within the last year

of employment if the officer solicits, recruits or induces an employee or consultant of PerkinElmer to end his or her employment with us, or engages directly or indirectly with a competing business (as defined in the agreement) within two years after the officer's termination date.

46 [PerkinElmer 2018 Proxy Statement](#)

Table of Contents

Equity Award Granting Practices

The following practices apply to all of our equity awards, including grants made under our LTIP. Our 2001 Incentive Plan and our 2005 Incentive Plan were each approved by shareholders (at our 2001 and 2005 annual meetings of shareholders, respectively). Our 2009 Incentive Plan was approved by shareholders at our 2009 annual meeting of shareholders, replacing our 2001 and 2005 Incentive Plans, and since that time has been the sole plan under which we grant equity awards. Our 2009 Incentive Plan was reapproved by shareholders at our April 22, 2014 annual meeting of shareholders, solely to allow awards granted under the plan to continue to qualify as performance-based compensation under Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code as in effect prior to the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. No changes were made to the 2009 Incentive Plan and the number of shares approved for issuance under the plan was not increased.

These incentive plans provide for grants of stock options, restricted stock, stock appreciation rights, other stock unit awards, performance units, and cash performance awards. The plans give the committee the latitude to design cash and stock-based incentive programs that promote high performance and the achievement of corporate goals. Employees, including our named executive officers and non-employee directors, are eligible to receive awards under these plans. All grants to our named executive officers since the 2009 annual meeting of shareholders have been made under our 2009 Incentive Plan.

The committee evaluates annual equity grants to officers, including the named executive officers, at the first committee meeting of each year. The approved grants become effective and the exercise price is set on the first day of the open trading window following the release of full year earnings, which is the date of grant. Therefore, the annual grant takes place after the release of material information regarding our annual financial performance.

Equity grants to new hires are generally granted on the 15th day of the month following the employee's date of hire. We primarily grant RSUs to employees below the officer level who receive equity awards. Stock options are awarded to a limited number of employees below the officer level.

The stock option exercise price is set at the average of the high and low prices on the date of grant. We believe this practice results in a grant price which more fairly represents the stock price over the course of the date of grant than the closing price on the date of grant, which could be arbitrarily high or low.

Our board administers all equity grants within the authority established within PerkinElmer's shareholder-approved incentive plans and, as permitted under the plan, delegates authority to administer the plans to the committee. The committee establishes the terms and conditions of each award, including vesting and performance criteria, and the time period applicable to the award. The committee may delegate approval to grant equity awards to non-officers to our stock award grant committee of which Mr. Friel is the sole member. The stock award grant committee does not have the authority to issue equity grants to officers.

At the end of fiscal year 2017, we had 7.6 million shares reserved for future equity grants. We had 2.7 million outstanding options and unvested shares, which represents 2.4% of our common shares outstanding. Our total dilution including shares reserved for future grants and outstanding options and unvested shares was 9.4%. In 2017, we granted 0.8 million shares (including shares granted under options and stock grants) or 0.7 % of our common shares outstanding. The committee annually reviews the potential dilutive effect of equity award programs from both a share and economic perspective as compared to industry peers. For fiscal year 2016, share dilution for our peer companies was 7.71% at the 25th percentile, 9.18% at median, and 11.75% at the 75th percentile (shares outstanding plus shares available for future grant, based on information from annual reports on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended 2016).

Table of Contents

Material Tax Implications of the Program

Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code generally disallows a tax deduction to public companies for certain compensation in excess of \$1 million paid to a company's Chief Executive Officer and certain other highly compensated executive officers. Pursuant to the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, signed into law on December 22, 2017 (the Tax Act), for fiscal years beginning after December 31, 2017, the compensation of the chief financial officer is also subject to the deduction limitation. Prior to 2018, specified compensation, including qualified performance-based compensation, was not subject to the deduction limit if certain requirements were met. The committee generally structured 2017 incentive compensation amounts and plans with the intention to allow satisfaction of the requirements for deductibility under this provision as in effect prior to the Tax Act. However, the committee considers it important to retain flexibility to design compensation programs that are in the best interests of PerkinElmer and our shareholders. In addition, because of uncertainties as to the application and interpretation of Section 162(m), as in effect both prior to and after the Tax Act, the committee cannot ensure that compensation intended by the committee to satisfy the requirements for deductibility under Section 162(m) for 2017 or earlier will in fact be deductible. Specific to compensation reported in this proxy statement for fiscal year 2017, the following elements do not meet the design requirements of Section 162(m): base salary and the restricted stock granted in 2015 and 2016.

Pursuant to the Tax Act, subject to certain transition rules, for fiscal years beginning after December 31, 2017, the performance-based compensation exception to the deduction limitations under Section 162(m) will no longer be available. As a result, beginning in 2018, compensation in excess of \$1 million paid to the specified executives is expected to be nondeductible unless it is paid pursuant to a grandfathered arrangement that remains eligible for qualification under the Tax Act transition rules. The committee reserves the right to use its business judgment to authorize compensation payments that may be subject to the limitations under Section 162(m) when the committee believes that compensation is appropriate and in the best interests of PerkinElmer and our shareholders, after taking into consideration changing business conditions and performance of our employees.

Compensation Committee Report

The compensation and benefits committee has reviewed and discussed the Compensation Discussion and Analysis with management and, based on such review and discussions, we recommended to the board of directors that the Compensation Discussion and Analysis be included in this proxy statement.

By the compensation and benefits committee of the board of directors:

Patrick J. Sullivan, Chair

Peter Barrett

Sylvie Grégoire, PharmD

Frank Witney, PhD

Table of Contents**Summary Compensation Table**

The following table sets forth information concerning the annual and long-term compensation for services to PerkinElmer for the 2017 fiscal year of (1) individuals who held the role of Chief Executive Officer during 2017, (2) individuals who held the role of Chief Financial Officer during 2017, and (3) the other three most highly compensated executive officers for 2017 who were serving as executive officers as of December 31, 2017.

Name and Principal Position	Year	Salary (\$)(1)	Stock Awards (\$)(2)(3)(4)	Option Awards (\$)(2)(4)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$)(4)(5)	Change in	All Other Compensation (\$)(7)	Total (\$)
						Pension Value and Nonqualified Deferred Compensation (\$)(6)		
Robert F. Friel Chairman and Chief Executive Officer	2017	\$ 1,063,200	\$ 2,658,000	\$ 1,328,158	\$ 4,855,874	\$ 1,342,126	\$ 118,239	\$ 11,365,597
	2016	\$ 1,054,615	\$ 1,771,679	\$ 1,771,530	\$ 3,886,571	\$ 925,848	\$ 111,981	\$ 9,522,224
	2015	\$ 1,029,054	\$ 1,724,983	\$ 1,725,027	\$ 3,336,426	\$ 574,768	\$ 113,898	\$ 8,504,156
Frank A. Wilson Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer	2017	\$ 538,692	\$ 610,888	\$ 305,248	\$ 1,226,440		\$ 68,288	\$ 2,749,556
	2016	\$ 524,692	\$ 396,755	\$ 396,722	\$ 997,159		\$ 63,444	\$ 2,378,772
	2015	\$ 510,385	\$ 386,254	\$ 386,261	\$ 860,187		\$ 64,531	\$ 2,207,618
James Corbett Executive Vice President and President, Discovery and Analytical Solutions	2017	\$ 505,000	\$ 631,226	\$ 315,426	\$ 1,022,540		\$ 14,978	\$ 2,489,170
	2016	\$ 460,539	\$ 843,988	\$ 338,975	\$ 779,740		\$ 21,782	\$ 2,445,024
	2015	\$ 427,692	\$ 293,343	\$ 293,342	\$ 577,502		\$ 13,983	\$ 1,605,862
Joel S. Goldberg Senior Vice President, Administration, General Counsel and Secretary	2017	\$ 460,100	\$ 521,631	\$ 260,661	\$ 1,084,227		\$ 65,190	\$ 2,391,809
	2016	\$ 448,308	\$ 338,996	\$ 338,975	\$ 848,729		\$ 63,840	\$ 2,038,848
	2015	\$ 432,308	\$ 293,343	\$ 293,342	\$ 763,629		\$ 61,097	\$ 1,843,719
Prahlad R. Singh Executive Vice President and President, Diagnostics	2017	\$ 464,231	\$ 556,301	\$ 357,361	\$ 411,140		\$ 19,821	\$ 1,808,854
	2016	\$ 413,994	\$ 159,982	\$ 159,971	\$ 419,073		\$ 19,863	\$ 1,172,883

NOTES

- (1) This column represents base salary amounts earned in fiscal years 2015, 2016 and 2017, respectively.
- (2) Ignoring the impact of the forfeiture rate, these amounts represent the aggregate grant date fair value of awards of options, shares and performance restricted stock units granted to each named executive officer in the applicable fiscal year. For a more detailed description of the assumptions used for purposes of determining grant date fair value, see Note 18 to the consolidated financial statements in our annual report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017.
- (3) The values shown in this column for 2017 for each named executive officer reflect the aggregate grant date fair value of restricted shares granted in 2017. On January 26, 2017, the committee approved grants under the 2017 LTIP to Messrs. Friel, Wilson, Corbett, Goldberg, and Singh. The committee approved an additional restricted stock grant to Mr. Singh which was granted on February 7, 2017. All of the restricted shares granted to our executive officers in 2017 vest 100% on the third anniversary of the date of grant. The values shown in this column for 2017 for each named executive officer also reflect the aggregate grant date fair value of performance restricted stock units (PRSUs) granted in 2017. On January 26, 2017, the committee approved grants of PRSUs under the 2017 LTIP to Messrs. Friel, Wilson, Corbett, Goldberg and Singh. All of the PRSUs granted to our executive officers in 2017 will vest on the third anniversary of the date of grant based on the achievement of financial performance metrics approved by the committee. A description of these awards is provided above in the Compensation Discussion and Analysis .

Table of Contents

- (4) Each of the executive officers named in the Summary Compensation Table received long-term awards in 2017. The awards to all of our executive officers were approved by the committee in January 2017. All of the 2017 awards are disclosed in the 2017 Grants of Plan-Based Awards table in this proxy statement. Outstanding stock option, restricted stock, PRSU and restricted stock unit awards are also disclosed in the 2017 Outstanding Equity Awards at Fiscal Year-End table in this proxy statement. Please refer to the Compensation Discussion and Analysis above for a full description of long-term awards.
- (5) The amounts reported in this column reflect short-term incentive bonus payments under our PIP and performance unit cash payments under our LTIP for performance in 2017. The amounts are as follows:

Named Executive Officer	Short-Term Incentive	Performance Unit Cash		Total
	Payments (PIP)	Awards under		
	(\$)	LTIP	(\$)	(\$)
Robert F. Friel	\$ 1,435,320	\$	3,420,554	\$ 4,855,874
Frank A. Wilson	\$ 460,508	\$	765,932	\$ 1,226,440
James Corbett	\$ 440,870	\$	581,670	\$ 1,022,540
Joel S. Goldberg	\$ 502,557	\$	581,670	\$ 1,084,227
Prahlad R. Singh	\$ 411,140	\$		\$ 411,140

Mr. Singh did not participate in our 2015 LTIP because the grant preceded his promotion to executive officer status. Please refer to the Compensation Discussion and Analysis above for a full description of these programs and awards.

- (6) The amounts in this column represent the change in pension value for each individual. No named executive officer received preferential or above-market earnings on deferred compensation. The increase of \$1,342,126 reported for Mr. Friel in the Summary Compensation Table primarily reflects the value of SERP benefit accruals from an additional year of service and compensation and an increase associated with lower discount rates, partially offset by a decrease associated with updated mortality assumptions. Please refer to the 2017 Pension Benefits section below for a full description of our pension and SERP.
- (7) The amounts reported in this column include our 401(k) Excess contributions to our deferred compensation plan for 2017 as follows: Mr. Friel: \$39,660; Mr. Wilson: \$13,475; and Mr. Goldberg: \$9,539. Also included are automobile allowance payments as follows: Mr. Friel: \$25,000; Mr. Wilson: \$17,498; and Mr. Goldberg: \$17,498. A financial planning allowance is also included in this column as follows: Mr. Friel: \$20,000; and Messrs. Wilson and Goldberg: \$12,000 each. Also included in this column for each eligible officer are our contributions to the qualified 401(k) plan, the premiums we paid for executive life insurance, the fee paid by us for the officer's annual executive physical, the incremental cost of any personal use of tickets to sporting events, and costs associated with offsite meetings.

Table of Contents**2017 Grants of Plan-Based Awards**

Grant Date (2)	Date of Compensation Committee Approval	Estimated Future Payouts Under Non-Equity Incentive Plan Awards			Estimated Future Payouts Under Equity Incentive Plan Awards			All Other Stock Awards: Number of Shares of Stock or Units (#)	All Other Option Awards: Number of Securities Underlying Option (#)	Exercise or Base Price of Awards (\$/Sh)	Closing Price on Date of Grant (\$/Sh)
		Threshold (\$)	Target (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Threshold (#)	Target (#)	Maximum (#)				
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(3)	\$ 531,600	\$ 1,329,000	\$ 3,189,600							
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(4)				10,089	25,223	60,535				
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(5)							25,223			
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(6)								115,221	\$ 52.65	\$ 52.6
N/A	1/26/2017(7)	\$ 531,600	\$ 1,063,200	\$ 1,807,440							
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(3)	\$ 122,178	\$ 305,444	\$ 733,065							
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(4)				2,319	5,797	13,913				
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(5)							5,797			
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(6)								26,481	\$ 52.65	\$ 52.6
N/A	1/26/2017(7)	\$ 190,050	\$ 380,100	\$ 646,170							
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(3)	\$ 126,245	\$ 315,613	\$ 757,471							
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(4)				2,396	5,990	14,376				
2/7/2017	1/26/2017(5)										