
FRAND

100083

" "

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED

2G CDMA IS-95 3G UMTS/WCDMA CDMA 2000/EVDO 4G

LTE

ETSI ^[1]

ETSI

208

2013 11

2015 2 9

CD

MA WCDMA LTE

CDMA WCDMA LTE

[1] European Telecommunication Standard Institute

60.88

[1]

2003

M8 M9 MX MX2 MX3 MX4

2006

NOTE MX4 PRO 2

NOTE2 3

3S

Android

Flyme

2016 6

[1]

[2]

2 FRAND
FRAND

FRAND

H.264

802.11

FRAND

2010 10

Windows

Xbox

2.25%

2010 11

FRAND

H.264

ITC

337

Xbox

ITC

Xbox

[3]

70

Georgia-Pacific

Georgia-Pacific

FRAND

4 5

[4]

FRAND

FRAND

FRAND

Georgia-Pacific

13

FRAND

[5]

FRAND

[1]

2011

59

[2]

FRAND

IDC

(1) 180
40
2 IDC
IDC ETSI FRAND ETSI 2008 11 IDC
ITC 2011 7 IDC 337 2011 12 6
IDC FRAND

FRAND

1.
1

FRAND

2

[1]

IDC

FRAND

3

IDC

2

[2]

[3]

[4]

1

[1] See *Microsoft Corp. v. Motorola Inc.*, No. C10-1823JLR 1, 21 W.D. Wash. Aug. 11, 2013 .

[2]

2

FRAND

3

FRAND

FRAND

The dispute on the standard essential patent licensing fees between QUALCOMM INCORPORATED and MEIZU is becoming more and more heated. People's eyes once again were focused on how to license to use the standard essential patent. What licensing fee can maximize the rights of both sides but not hinder the development and innovation of science and technology. This paper attempts to start from the INCORPORATED and MEIZU case and combine two typical cases in order to study the essence of the standard essential patent licensing, the great impact on the society and how to determine a

icensing