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Abstract—In this paper, a new WINNER+ based three dimensional (3D) non-stationary geometry-based stochastic model (GBSM) for multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) channels is proposed, as well as extended evolving algorithms of time-variant channel parameters. Meanwhile, important statistical properties of the channel model, i.e., time-variant autocorrelation function (ACF), time-variant cross-correlation function (CCF), and time-variant Doppler power spectrum density (DPSD) are derived and analyzed. Moreover, we propose an efficient hardware implementation method, namely sum-of-frequency-modulation (SoFM) method, to generate non-stationary channel coefficients. By utilizing a compact hardware architecture with SoFM modules, the proposed 3D non-stationary GBSM is realized on a field-programmable gate array (FPGA) hardware platform. Simulations and hardware measurement results demonstrate that our proposed channel simulator and emulator can get more accurate and realistic Doppler frequency than those of the existing models. In addition, hardware measurements of statistical properties are also consistent well with the corresponding theoretical ones, which verifies the correctness of both the hardware emulation scheme and theoretical derivations.

Index Terms—3D non-stationary GBSM, MIMO channel model, WINNER+ channel model, hardware emulation, sum-of-frequency-modulation method, statistical properties.

I. INTRODUCTION

MULTIPLE-INPUT multiple-output (MIMO) technologies have widely been used to improve spectral efficiency and link reliability significantly [1]–[3]. By utilizing the cross-polarized antenna and spatial resource, the three-dimensional (3D) MIMO technology has also become a promising solution for the fifth generation (5G) communication systems [4], [5]. However, all these benefits can only be achieved with the thorough understanding of propagation characteristics of the underlying channel. Measurement campaigns have proved that the stationary assumption is only valid for a short time interval [6] and it would be even shorter in high mobility scenarios, such as high speed train (HST) channels [7], [8] and vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) channels [9]. Therefore, the 3D MIMO and non-stationary aspects should be taken into account when designing channel models of 5G systems.

There are limited non-stationary channel models that have been reported in the literature [10]–[24]. Those models can be classified as deterministic models [10], [11], non-geometrical stochastic models (NGSMs) [12], [13], and geometry-based stochastic models (GBSMs) [14]–[24]. The deterministic models, as an alternative model in METIS [10] and the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) 3D channel model [11], are based on the ray-tracing method. Although with high accuracy, deterministic channel models need a detailed digital map with specific trajectories and their simulations are also very time consuming. The NGSMs [12], [13] characterize the channel in a completely stochastic way. As all parameters are extracted from measurements, NGSMs do not include geometrical information and cannot be used for system-level simulations.

To guarantee a good tradeoff between the complexity and accuracy of the model, GBSMs were proposed for both stationary channel modeling [25]–[30] and non-stationary channel modeling [14]–[24]. For example, a time evolving channel model based on the WINNER II model [30] was proposed in [14] and [15], where the channel was split into several independent segments and the WINNERII model was applied in each segment. The two dimensional (2D) non-stationary channel models for HST and massive MIMO channels can be found in [16], [17], and [18], respectively. The authors in [16] and [18] assumed that the scatterers were distributed on multiple ellipses based on different delays and the channel states were updated by tracking the instantaneous positions of the mobile relay (MR) [16] or the mobile station (MS) [18]. The multi-bounced scatterers were also taken into account by a 2D twin-cluster approach in [17], which made the model become more realistic. A 3D non-stationary channel model under the V2V scenario was proposed in [19], where scatterers were distributed as two regular spheres and moved together with the vehicles. The authors considered the random movement of the MS and described the trajectory as a Brownian process in [20]. Moreover, the 3D twin-cluster approach was adopted in
[21] and [22] to model 3D non-stationary mobile channels and massive MIMO channels, respectively.

It should be highlighted that the aforementioned non-stationary GBSMs [14]–[22] can be viewed as the modified GBSMs with time-variant channel parameters. The major effort of these models focused on the evolving algorithms of channel parameters along time [14]–[17], [19]–[21] or along both time and antenna location [18], [22]. However, we have found that the output fading phases generated by these models are not accurate, which results in the output Doppler power spectrum density (DPSD) not consistent with the corresponding analytical one [23]. Some latest works such as [24] and [23] have indeed realized this shortcoming and considered the right formulation of the time-varying phase. However, the authors in [24] only considered 2D scattering environments and did not give the computation method of time evolving channel parameters. The previous work of our group [23] proposed a new 3D non-stationary channel model with the accurate fading phase and DPSD for the first time, but it did not give the detailed statistical properties of the proposed model.

Compared with field tests, the hardware emulation method is visible, controllable, and repeatable. It provides better real-time variant autocorrelation function (ACF), cross-correlation posed 3D non-stationary GBSM. Moreover, the expressions of account, a new 3D correlation function is derived for the pro-

realistic Doppler frequency and DPSD.

3) With the new idea of sum-of-frequency-modulation (SoFM) method, an efficient hardware implementation method tailored for the proposed non-stationary channel simulator is proposed. On this basis, a compact channel emulation scheme with low complexity on a field-programmable gate array (FPGA) platform is developed and validated.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the original 3D stationary WINNER+ channel model is briefly introduced. Section III proposes our new 3D non-stationary channel model, as well as the extended algorithms of estimating channel parameters. In addition, the theoretical results of ACF, CCF, and DPSD for our model are derived. In Section IV, an efficient hardware implementation method and the compact hardware structure based on the SoFM module are presented. In this section, the hardware resource consumption is also given and analyzed. The test results of the channel emulator are presented in Section V. Finally, the conclusions are given in Section VI.

II. A 3D STATIONARY GBSM FOR MIMO CHANNELS

The small scale-fading channel model in the 3D WINNER+ model employs a GBSM to represent the propagation channel between the base station (BS) and MS. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the first and last clusters of each path are defined by their own locations and velocities, while the rest of clusters between them are abstracted by several virtual links that are characterized by different delays and powers. For each path, the azimuth angles of departure (AAoDs) and elevation angles of departure (EAoDs) are only related with the first cluster, and the azimuth angles of arrival (AAoAs) and elevation angles of arrival (EAoAs) are only related to the last cluster.

Under the stationary condition, the complex channel impulse response (CIR) between the BS antenna element \( s \) \((s = 1, 2, \ldots, S)\) and MS antenna element \( u \) \((u = 1, 2, \ldots, U)\) can be expressed by [29]

\[
h_{u,s}(t, \tau) = \delta(t - \tau) P_n h_{u,s,n}(t) \delta(\tau - \tau_n). \tag{1}
\]

It contains \( N \) multiple paths characterized by delay \( \tau_n \), path power \( P_n \), and channel coefficient \( h_{u,s,n}(t) \) with normalized power. Here, \( h_{u,s,n}(t) \) can be further modeled as the summation of finite sub-paths [29], i.e.,

\[
\tilde{h}_{u,s,n}(t) = \sqrt{\frac{M}{M}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{n,m} e^{j k(\hat{r}_{MS,s,n,m} - \hat{r}_{BS,u,n,m})} e^{j k(\hat{r}_{BS,u,n,m} - \hat{r}_{MS,s,n,m})} \tag{2}
\]

where \( M \) denotes the number of sub-paths, \( \Phi_{n,m} \) is the random initial phase and is assumed to be distributed uniformly over \( (0, 2\pi) \), \( k = 2\pi f_c/c \) denotes the wave number, \( f_c \) and \( c \) represent the carrier frequency and the speed of light, respectively, \( \hat{r}_{MS,u} = [d_{MS,u}^x, d_{MS,u}^y, d_{MS,u}^z]^T \) and \( \hat{r}_{BS,s} = [d_{BS,s}^x, d_{BS,s}^y, d_{BS,s}^z]^T \) are the 3D locations of receive antenna \( u \) in the MS coordinate system \((x'y'z')\) and transmit antenna \( s \) in the BS coordinate system \((xyz)\), respectively. In (2), \( \hat{r}_{MS,s,n,m} \) is the arrival angle unit vector of the \( m \)th sub-path within the
nth path with AAoA $\phi_{n,m}^{\text{AAoA}}$ and EAoA $\theta_{n,m}^{\text{EAOA}}$, and is defined by [21]

$$
\hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m} = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\sin(\phi_{n,m}^{\text{AAoA}}) \\
\sin(\theta_{n,m}^{\text{EAOA}})
\end{array} \right]
$$

while $\hat{r}_{\text{BS},n,m}$ is the departure angle unit vector of the $n$th sub-path within the $n$th path with AAoD $\phi_{n,m}^{\text{AAoD}}$ and EAOD $\theta_{n,m}^{\text{EAOA}}$, and is given by

$$
\hat{r}_{\text{BS},n,m} = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\sin(\phi_{n,m}^{\text{AAoA}}) \\
\sin(\theta_{n,m}^{\text{EAOA}})
\end{array} \right].
$$

The theoretical Doppler frequency of the $n$th sub-path within the $n$th path in (2) can be calculated by [29]

$$
f_{n,m} = \frac{\|\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}\| \cos(\theta_{\text{AAoA},n,m})}{c} f_c
$$

where $\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}$ and $\|\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}\|$ denote the vector and magnitude of the MS velocity, respectively. Here, $\theta_{\text{AAoA},n,m}$ is the angle between $\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}$ and $\hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}$, and can be expressed as

$$
\theta_{\text{AAoA},n,m} = \arccos \left( \frac{\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}^T \hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}}{\|\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}\| \|\hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}\|} \right).
$$

Submitting (6) into (5) and holding $\|\hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}\| = 1$, we can obtain

$$
f_{n,m} = k \frac{\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}^T \hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}}{2\pi}.
$$

It should be noticed that the third exponential item in (2), denoted as $\psi_{n,m}(t) = 2\pi f_{n,m} t = k(\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}^T \hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}) t$, represents the corresponding phase caused by the Doppler frequency. According to the relationship between the frequency and phase, the output Doppler frequency can be calculated as

$$
f' = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{d\psi_{n,m}(t)}{dt} = k \frac{\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}^T \hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}}{2\pi}
$$

which equals to the corresponding theoretical one $f_{n,m}$ as in (7).

III. A NEW 3D NON-STATIONARY GBSM AND STATISTICAL PROPERTIES

A. The proposed 3D non-stationary GBSM

The CIR of our proposed 3D non-stationary GBSM can be expressed as

$$
h_{u,s}(t,\tau) = \sum_{n=1}^N P_n(t) h_{u,s,n}(t) \delta(\tau - \tau_n(t))
$$

where

$$
\tilde{h}_{u,s,n}(t) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M e^{j k(\hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}^T \hat{r}_{\text{MS},u,s} + \hat{r}_{\text{BS},n,m}^T \hat{r}_{\text{BS},u,s})} \\
\cdot e^{j k(\hat{r}_{\text{BS},n,m} \hat{r}_{\text{BS},u,s}(t))} \\
\cdot e^{j k f_n'(\hat{v}_{n,m} \hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}(t))}.
$$

Here, channel model parameters in (9) and (10) such as $N(t)$, $P_n(t)$, $\tau_n(t)$, $\hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}^T$, $\hat{r}_{\text{BS},n,m}^T$, and $\hat{r}_{\text{BS},u,s}(t)$ are all time-variant, which capture the non-stationarity characteristics of the underlying channel.

The theoretical Doppler frequency of non-stationary channels would change over time and can be denoted as $f_{n,m}(t) = k \frac{\hat{v}_{n,m}^T \hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}^T}{2\pi}$. Most of the existing non-stationary channel models [14]–[22] directly used the phase $\psi_{n,m}(t)$ to substitute $\psi_{n,m}(t)$. However, in this case, the output time-variant Doppler frequency can be proved as

$$
f' = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{d\psi_{n,m}(t)}{dt} = \frac{k v_{\text{MS}}^T \hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}^T}{2\pi} + \frac{t}{2\pi} \frac{d\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}^T \hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}^T}{dt}
$$

which does not agree with the corresponding theoretical one. To overcome this problem, we use $\psi_{n,m}(t) = k \int_0^t (\hat{v}_{n,m}^T \hat{r}_{\text{MS},n,m}^T) dt$ instead of $\psi_{n,m}(t)$ to represent the effect of the Doppler frequency [23]. It’s easy to demonstrate that the output Doppler frequency of our proposed model equals to the theoretical one, i.e., $\frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{d\psi_{n,m}(t)}{dt} = f_{n,m}(t)$. In addition, unlike the WINNER+ model, we take the movement of cluster $Z_n$ into account by replacing item $\hat{v}_{\text{MS}}$ of (2) with the relative velocity between the MS and cluster $Z_n$ as

$$
\tilde{v}_{\text{z,n,MS}} = [v_{\text{z,n,MS}}^x v_{\text{z,n,MS}}^y v_{\text{z,n,MS}}^z]
$$

where $\hat{v}_{\text{MS}} = [v_{\text{MS}}^x v_{\text{MS}}^y v_{\text{MS}}^z]$ and $\tilde{v}_{\text{z,n}} = [v_{\text{z,n}}^x v_{\text{z,n}}^y v_{\text{z,n}}^z]$ denote the velocity vectors of the MS and cluster $Z_n$, respectively. Moreover, it should be mentioned that the new model also supports time-variant movements situation and this can be guaranted by replacing $\tilde{v}_{\text{z,n,MS}}$ with $\tilde{v}_{\text{z,n,MS}}(t)$. The detailed definitions of channel parameters can be found in Table I.

B. Time-variant channel parameters

1) Path number

The number of valid paths is time-variant due to the movements of the MS and clusters, which means some clusters will disappear and some new clusters will appear. This was mentioned in [29] as the birth-death process. Let us set the birth and death rates
\[ D_{\text{BS,}A_n}(t) = \sqrt{D_{\text{BS,}A_n}^2(t-\Delta t) + (\lVert \vec{v}_{A_n} \lVert \Delta t)^2 + 2D_{\text{BS,}A_n}(t-\Delta t) \sin \theta_{\text{E AoD}}(t-\Delta t) \lVert \vec{v}_{A_n} \lVert \Delta t \cos (\phi_{\text{E AoD}}(t-\Delta t) - \theta_{A_n})} \]  

\[ D_{\text{Zn,MS}}(t) = \sqrt{D_{\text{Zn,MS}}^2(t-\Delta t) + (\lVert \vec{v}_{\text{Zn,MS}} \lVert \Delta t)^2 + 2D_{\text{Zn,MS}}(t-\Delta t) \sin \theta_{\text{E AoD}}(t-\Delta t) \lVert \vec{v}_{\text{Zn,MS}} \lVert \Delta t \cos (\theta_{\text{Zn,MS}} - \phi_{\text{E AoD}}(t-\Delta t))} \]  

\[ D_{\text{LOS}}(t) = \sqrt{D_{\text{LOS}}^2(t-\Delta t) + (\lVert \vec{v}_{\text{MS}} \lVert \Delta t)^2 + \frac{D_{\text{LOS}}^2(t-\Delta t) + (\lVert \vec{v}_{\text{MS}} \lVert \Delta t)^2 - D_{\text{LOS}}^2(t_0) \Delta t}{t}} \]  

**TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( N(t) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(_n) (t), ( r_n(t) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \vec{d}<em>{\text{BS,}s}(t), \vec{d}</em>{\text{MS,}u}(t) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \vec{v}<em>{\text{MS}}, \vec{v}</em>{A_n}, \vec{v}_{Z_n} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta_{\text{BS,}A_n}(t), \theta_{\text{BS,}Z_n}(t) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta_{\text{BS,}A_{n,m}}(t), \theta_{\text{BS,}Z_{n,m}}(t) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta_{\text{E AoD}}(\theta), \phi_{\text{E AoD}}(\theta), \phi_{\text{E AoA}}(\theta), \phi_{\text{E AoA}}(\theta) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta_{\text{E AoD}}(\theta), \phi_{\text{E AoD}}(\theta), \phi_{\text{E AoA}}(\theta), \phi_{\text{E AoA}}(\theta) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{\text{LOS}}(t), D_{\text{BS,}A_n}(t), D_{\text{Zn,MS}}(t) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of valid propagation paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power and delay of the ( n)th path, respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D location vectors of the BS antennas ( s ) and MS antenna ( u ), respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D velocity vectors of the MS and clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>departure and arrival angle unit vectors of the ( n)th path, respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS antenna ( n ), respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>departure and arrival angle unit vectors of the ( n)th ray within the path, respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean angles of the E AoD, E AoA, E AoA, and AAoA of the ( n)th path, respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E AoD, E AoA, and AAoA of the ( n)th ray within the path, respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distances of BS to MS, BS to cluster ( A_n ), and MS to cluster ( Z_n ), respectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as \( \lambda_G \) and \( \lambda_R \), respectively, and model the evolution of path number as a Markov process [37]. The movement of clusters in a realistic environment is random and unknowable, while the average velocity can be obtained by the measurement campaign. It is assumed that the average velocity of cluster \( A_n \), \( n = 1, \ldots, N \) (or \( Z_n \), \( n = 1, \ldots, N \)) is \( \vec{v}_A \) (or \( \vec{v}_Z \)). Thus, the mean survival probability of each path during time interval \( \Delta t \) can be calculated by the average velocities as [22]

\[ P_{\text{remain}} = \exp(-\lambda_R \{P_c(\lVert \vec{v}_A \lVert + \lVert \vec{v}_Z \lVert) \Delta t + \lVert \vec{v}_{\text{MS}} \lVert \Delta t)\} \]  

\[ \text{(13)} \]

where \( P_c \) denotes the percentage of movement, \( \lVert \vec{v}_A \lVert, \lVert \vec{v}_Z \lVert \) are the magnitudes of mean velocities of cluster \( A_n \) and \( Z_n \), respectively, and \( \lVert \vec{v}_{\text{MS}} \lVert \) is the velocity of MS. In order to keep the average number of valid paths constant, the number of newly generated paths \( N_{\text{new}}(t) \) is modeled by a Poisson process with the expectation as

\[ E\{N_{\text{new}}(t)\} = \frac{\lambda_G}{\lambda_R} (1 - P_{\text{remain}}). \]  

\[ \text{(14)} \]

Combining (13) with (14), we can obtain the average path number as

\[ E\{N(t)\} = N(t-\Delta t)P_{\text{remain}} + E\{N_{\text{new}}(t)\} = \frac{\lambda_G}{\lambda_R} \]  

\[ \text{(15)} \]

which only depends on the parameters of birth and death rates.

2) Path distances

With the movements of the MS and clusters, the distances between the MS, BS, and clusters will change over time. Measurement campaigns in [7] have shown that the stationary interval is very short, i.e., 9 ms for 80% and 20 ms for 60%. In this paper, all velocities are assumed to keep constant within the short stationary interval. All velocities are assumed to keep constant during the short analytical time interval and the initial distances between the BS (MS) and cluster \( A_n \) (\( Z_n \)) are obtained by a measurement campaign or generation randomly. We have proved that the instantaneous distances at time instant \( t \) can be calculated from the following iterative algorithms (16)–(18), where \( \theta_{A_n} = \arctan(v_{A_n}^x/v_{A_n}^y) \) and \( \theta_{Z_n,MS} = \arctan(v_{Z_n,MS}^y/v_{Z_n,MS}^x) \).

3) Delays and powers

For the \( n\)th valid path, the total delay at time instant \( t \) equals to the summation of the delay of the first bounce, delay of the virtual link, and delay of the last bounce, and is also determined by the total distance as

\[ \tau_{n}(t) = \frac{D_{\text{BS,}A_n}(t) + D_{\text{Zn,MS}(t)} + D_{\text{A_n,}Z_n}(t)}{c} \]  

\[ \text{(19)} \]

where \( \bar{\tau}_{n}(t) \) denotes the equivalent delay of virtual link and can be updated by a first-order filtering method [22].

\[ \bar{\tau}_{n}(t) = \tau_{n}(t-\Delta t) e^{-\Delta t/\tau_{\text{dec}}} + (1 - e^{-\Delta t/\tau_{\text{dec}}})X \]  

\[ \text{(20)} \]

where \( X \sim U[D_{\text{LOS}}(t)/c, \tau_{\text{max}}], \tau_{\text{max}} \) and \( \tau_{\text{dec}} \) denote the maximum delay and decorrelation speed of time-variant delays. The average power of this path can be calculated by the measurement-based method [29] as,

\[ P'_{n}(t) = e^{-\tau_{n}(t)\frac{1-\xi_{DS}}{\xi_{DS}} D_{\text{LOS}}(t)} \times 10^{-\frac{40}{70}} \]  

\[ \text{(21)} \]

where \( \xi_{n}, \tau_{DS}, \) and \( r_{DS} \) denote the shadow term, delay distribution, and delay spread, respectively. Finally, the total power of all paths should be normalized as

\[ P_{n}(t) = P'_{n}(t)/\sum_{n=1}^{N(t)} P'_{n}(t). \]  

\[ \text{(22)} \]
The number of valid paths can see that the delay of each path increases and the minimum simulation trial from our non-stationary channel model. In

\[ \vec{v}_n \]

\[ A \]

\[ \phi \]

\[ EAoA_n(t) = \begin{cases} \arctan \left( \frac{\sqrt{D_{BA,n}(t) \sin \theta_{EAoD}(t) \sin \phi_{EAoD}(t) \cos \phi_{EAoD}(t)}}{\sqrt{D_{BA,n}(t) \cos \phi_{EAoD}(t)}} \right), & \text{if } 0 \leq \theta_{EAoD}(t) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \\ \pi - \arctan \left( \frac{\sqrt{D_{BA,n}(t) \sin \theta_{EAoD}(t) \sin \phi_{EAoD}(t) \cos \phi_{EAoD}(t)}}{\sqrt{D_{BA,n}(t) \cos \phi_{EAoD}(t)}} \right), & \text{if } \frac{\pi}{2} < \theta_{EAoD}(t) \leq \pi \end{cases} \]

\( D_{LOD}(t_0) = 100 \text{ m}, \parallel \vec{v}_{A_n} \parallel \text{ and } \parallel \vec{v}_{Z_n} \parallel \sim U(0, 60) \text{ km/h, and all directional parameters are generated randomly. Fig. 2 (a) gives the time-variant 3D power delay profile (PDP) of one simulation trial from our non-stationary channel model. In order to highlight time-variation of path delays, y axis adopts the absolute delay. As the MS moves away from the BS, we can see that the delay of each path increases and the minimum value is limited by } D_{LOD}(t)/c. \text{ Fig. 2 (a) also demonstrates the disappearance and appearance of valid paths over time, as well as dynamic changes of delays and powers. Meanwhile, Fig. 2 (b) calculates the total number of valid paths at different times. It is shown that the number is fluctuated around initial value and the average value is about 19.9, matching well with the result of (15).} 

4) Angles for the 3D channel model

Measurement results in [29] have indicated that the marginal distribution of power angular spectrum (PAS) in the elevation plane follows the Laplacian distribution, while the PAS in the azimuth plane follows the truncated Gaussian distribution. In this paper, the angles of initial paths or newly generated paths are following those two distributions. In order to keep
\[ \alpha_n^{\text{AAoD}}(t) = \arccos \frac{D_{\text{BS,}A_n}(t_0) \sin \theta_n^{\text{AAoD}}(t_0) + \| \vec{v}_{A_n} \| t \cos(\phi_n^{\text{AAoD}}(t_0) - \theta_{A_n})}{\sqrt{(D_{\text{BS,}A_n}(t_0) \sin \theta_n^{\text{AAoD}}(t_0) + \| \vec{v}_{A_n} \| t)^2 + 2D_{\text{BS,}A_n}(t_0) \sin \theta_n^{\text{AAoD}}(t_0) \| \vec{v}_{A_n} \| t \cos(\phi_n^{\text{AAoD}}(t_0) - \theta_{A_n})}} \] (27)

\[ \gamma_n^{\text{AAoA}}(t) = \arccos \frac{D_{\text{MS,}A_n}(t_0) \sin \theta_n^{\text{AAoA}}(t_0) + \| \vec{v}_{A_n} \| t \cos(\phi_n^{\text{AAoA}}(t_0) - \theta_{A_n})}{\sqrt{(D_{\text{MS,}A_n}(t_0) \sin \theta_n^{\text{AAoA}}(t_0) + \| \vec{v}_{A_n} \| t)^2 + 2D_{\text{MS,}A_n}(t_0) \sin \theta_n^{\text{AAoA}}(t_0) \| \vec{v}_{A_n} \| t \cos(\phi_n^{\text{AAoA}}(t_0) - \theta_{A_n})}} \] (28)

PAS distributions unchanged over time, we only track the mean angles of EAoD, EAoA, AAoD, and AAoA. Based on geometrical relationships, the time evolving functions of the mean angles of EAoD and EAoA are derived as (23) and (24), where \( \theta_n^{\text{EAoA}}(t_0), \phi_n^{\text{AAoA}}(t_0), \theta_n^{\text{EAoD}}(t_0), \) and \( \phi_n^{\text{AAoD}}(t_0) \) denote the initial values of the EAoD, AAoD, EAoA, and AAoA of the nth path, respectively. Since the derivations of (23) and (24) are similar, only the proof of (23) is given in Appendix A. Similarly, the time-variant mean angles of AAoD and AAoA are also derived as (25) and (26), where \( \alpha_n^{\text{AAoD}}(t) \) and \( \gamma_n^{\text{AAoA}}(t) \) are two time-variant angle offsets and can be expressed by (27) and (28). The derivations of (27) and (28) are omitted for breif.

C. Statistical properties analysis

The CIR of the proposed 3D non-stationary GBSM is a 3D stochastic process in terms of the time, delay and antenna locations. The corresponding channel transfer function (CTF) can be defined by the Fourier transform of CIR [42],

\[ H_{u,s}(t, f, \vec{d}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_{u,s}(t, \tau) e^{-j2\pi f \tau} d\tau \]

\[ = \sum_{n=1}^{N(t)} \sqrt{P_n(t)} h_{u,s,n}(t) e^{-j2\pi f \tau_n(t)} \] (29)

where \( \vec{d} = \{ \vec{d}_{\text{BS}}, \vec{d}_{\text{MS}} \} \) is the antenna location vectors of transmitter and receiver. Then, the 3D correlation function of the proposed non-stationary GBSM can be expressed as [42]

\[ R(t, f, \vec{d}, \Delta t, \Delta f, \Delta \vec{d}) = E\{ H_{u,s}(t, f, \vec{d}) H_{u,s}^*(t + \Delta t, f + \Delta f, \vec{d} + \Delta \vec{d}) \} \] (30)

where \( \Delta t \) and \( \Delta f \) denote the time lag and frequency lag, respectively, and \( \Delta \vec{d} = \{ \Delta \vec{d}_{\text{BS}}, \Delta \vec{d}_{\text{MS}} \} \) means the space lag vector of the transmitter and receiver.

In this paper, we assume the underlying MIMO channel is only non-stationary in the time domain, while remains stationary in the frequency and space domain. The stationarity of frequency domain implies that the scatterers of different paths are uncorrelated, namely the uncorrelated scattering (US) assumption [44]. Similarly, the stationarity of space domain implies that the signals with different angles are uncorrelated, namely the homogeneous channels assumption [44]. By applying these two assumptions, the correlation function can be simplified as

\[ R_{u_1,s_1}^{u_2,s_2}(t; \Delta t, \Delta f) \]

\[ = E\left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{N(t)} \sqrt{P_n(t)} h_{u_1,s_1,n}(t) \cdot \bar{h}_{u_2,s_2,n}(t; \Delta t, \Delta f) e^{j2\pi f \tau_n(t)} \right\} \] (31)

where the space lag is omitted and replaced by antenna indexes \( u_i, s_i, i = 1, 2 \), and \( \{ t + \Delta t \} N(t) \) represents the set of shared paths. It should be mentioned that (31) is a universal expression of the 3D correlation function for any non-stationary wideband channel. In the following, it will be applied to calculate two important one dimensional (1D) correlation functions, ACF and CCF, which are widely used on evaluating and optimizing communication systems. Moreover, \( R_{u_1,s_1}^{u_2,s_2,n}(t; \Delta t, \Delta f) \) in (31) denotes the correlation function of one shared path and can easily be used to obtain the correlation property of the underlying channel.

Case 1: time-variant normalized ACF

The effect of survival probability from \( t \) to \( t + \Delta t \) should be taken into account and the normalized ACF of the nth path can be expressed by setting \( u_i = u, s_i = s, i = 1, 2 \), and \( \Delta f = 0 \) in (31) as

\[ \rho_{u,s,n}(t, \Delta t) = \frac{P_{u,s,n}(t; \Delta t, \Delta f = 0)}{\sqrt{P_n(t)} P_n(t + \Delta t)} \]

\[ = E\left\{ \bar{h}_{u,s,n}(t) e^{j2\pi f \tau_n(t)} \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{M} \exp(-\lambda n(t; \Delta t) \sum_{n=1}^{M} \sum_{n=1}^{M} \delta(t) \delta(\tau_n) \delta(\tau_n + \Delta t) \delta(t) \delta(\tau_n) \delta(\tau_n + \Delta t)} \cdot \sum_{m=1}^{M} \exp(-\lambda m(t; \Delta t) \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \delta(t) \delta(\tau_m) \delta(\tau_m + \Delta t) \delta(t) \delta(\tau_m) \delta(\tau_m + \Delta t)} \right\} \] (32)

Both the transmitter and receiver are equipped with linear antenna arrays, all elements of which are arranged along x axis. Thus, the items \( A_n(t; \Delta t), B_n(t; \Delta t), C_n(t, \Delta t), \) and \( D_n(t; \Delta t) \) in (32) can be further expressed as
\[ A_n(t, \Delta t) = \exp\{jkd_{MS,u}^T \sin(\theta_{n,m}^{EAoA}(t)) \cdot \cos(\theta_{n,m}^{EAoA}(t) - \sin(\theta_{n,m}^{EAoA}(t + \Delta t)) \cdot \cos(\theta_{n,m}^{EAoA}(t + \Delta t)) \} \]

\[ B_n(t, \Delta t) = \exp\{jkd_{BS,u}^T \sin(\theta_{n,m}^{EAoD}(t)) \cdot \cos(\phi_{n,m}^{AAoD}(t) - \sin(\phi_{n,m}^{AAoD}(t + \Delta t)) \cdot \cos(\phi_{n,m}^{AAoD}(t + \Delta t)) \} \]

\[ C_n(t, \Delta t) = \exp\{jk \int_{t}^{t+\Delta t} (\nu_{ZoMS}^{EAoA}(t')) \cdot \cos(\phi_{n,m}^{AAoD}(t') + \nu_{ZoMS}^{EAoA}(t')) \cdot \sin(\phi_{n,m}^{AAoD}(t') + \nu_{ZoMS}^{EAoA}(t')) dt \} \]

\[ D_n(t, \Delta t) = \exp\{2\pi f(\tau_n(t + \Delta t) - \tau_n(t)) \}. \]

It should be mentioned that the theoretical expressions of ACF given in [17, (36)–(38)] are only valid for 2D non-stationary channels. Moreover, the ACFs given in [17, 21, 22] did not include the effect of time-variant delays shown as \( D_n(t, \Delta t) \) in (32).

**Case 2: Time-variant normalized CCF**

By setting \( \Delta t = 0 \) and \( \Delta f = 0 \) in (31), we can obtain the normalized CCF of \( n \)th path between two different channels as

\[ \rho_{u_2, s_2, n_1}(t; \Delta t = 0, \Delta f = 0) = \sqrt{P_n(t)P_n(t)} \]

\[ C_n(t, \Delta t) = \exp\{jk \int_{t}^{t+\Delta t} (\nu_{ZoMS}^{EAoA}(t')) \cdot \cos(\phi_{n,m}^{AAoD}(t') + \nu_{ZoMS}^{EAoA}(t')) \cdot \sin(\phi_{n,m}^{AAoD}(t') + \nu_{ZoMS}^{EAoA}(t')) dt \} \]

\[ D_n(t, \Delta t) = \exp\{2\pi f(\tau_n(t + \Delta t) - \tau_n(t)) \}. \]

\[ \rho_{u_2, s_2, n_1}(t) = \frac{P_{u_2, s_2, n_1}}{P_1(t)} \]

\[ \sum_{n=1}^{M} \mathbb{E}\{h_{u_2, s_2, n_1}(t)e^{-j2\pi f_{\tau_n}(t)}\} \]

\[ \exp\{jk\Delta t\sin(\theta_{n,m}^{EAoA}(t)) \cdot \cos(\phi_{n,m}^{AAoD}(t)) \} \}

\[ (34) \]

where \( \Delta d_{BS} = \| \bar{d}_{BS,u_1} - \bar{d}_{BS, u_2} \| \) and \( \Delta d_{MS} = \| \bar{d}_{MS,u_1} - \bar{d}_{MS, u_2} \| \) denote the space lags at the transmitter and receiver, respectively. The proposed non-stationary GBSM supports that whether the azimuth angles and elevation angles are both correlated or not. However, in order to be compatible with the WINNER+ model, they are assumed to be uncorrelated and follow the Gaussian distribution and Laplacian distribution, respectively. Under this situation, the CCF of (34) can be further simplified as

\[ \rho_{u_2, s_2, n_1}(t) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \mathbb{E}\{h_{u_2, s_2, n_1}(t)e^{-j2\pi f_{\tau_n}(t)}\} \]

\[ \exp\{jk\Delta t\sin(\theta_{n,m}^{EAoA}(t)) \cdot \cos(\phi_{n,m}^{AAoD}(t)) \} \}

\[ (35) \]

The DPSD of the non-stationary channel is also time-variant and defined by the Fourier transform of ACF as

\[ S_{u,s,n}(t, \nu) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho_{u,s,n}(t, \Delta t)e^{-j2\pi \nu \Delta t} d\Delta t \]

where \( \nu \) means the frequency in the Doppler domain. By submitting (32)–(33) into (36), we can obtain the analytical DPSD of any propagation path.

**IV. A HIGHLY EFFICIENT HARDWARE CHANNEL EMULATOR**

**A. Hardware implementation**

Due to its popularity, FPGA has been widely used as the hardware platform of channel emulators [34]–[39]. Table II compares some representative emulators reported recently. To the best of authors’ knowledge, there are no emulator reported in literature supporting non-stationary 3D MIMO channel models as the proposed GBSM in this paper. In addition, there are several methods, as shown in Table II, which can be used to emulate the channel coefficients, i.e., SoC method, Doppler filter method, AR method, and their derivatives. Unfortunately, these methods are designed only for stationary channel models with fixed channel parameters.

In order to implement our channel model on a FPGA hardware platform, we firstly transform the complex CIR of (9) to the discrete time domain as

\[ h_{u,s}(l, \zeta) = \sum_{n=1}^{N(l)} \sqrt{P_n(l)}h_{u_2, s_2, n_1}(\zeta - |\tau_n(l)|_{T_s}) \]

where the sampling interval is \( T_s \), \( l \) and \( \zeta \) are the discrete time indexes in the time domain and delay domain, respectively, and \( |\tau_n(l)|_{T_s} \) denotes the integer part of discrete delay. Then, in order to make implementation simpler, we rewrite \( h_{u,s,n}(l) \) to the following form,

\[ \tilde{h}_{u,s,n}(l) = \sqrt{\Pi} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \exp\{j[l1(\sum_{l=0}^{N(l)-1}2\pi f_{\tau_n}(l)T_s + \Theta_{\text{initial}}(l) + \Phi_{\text{sum}})]\} \]

\[ (38) \]

Notice that each sub-path in (38) has the same form as a frequency modulation signal with the time-variant frequency \( f_{n,m}(l) \), time-variant phase \( \Theta_{u,s,n,m}(l) \), and initial phase \( \Phi_{n,m} \). Thus, each propagation path can be emulated by the

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>2D-MIMO 2D-MIMO 2D-MIMO 3D-MIMO 3D-MIMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>No No Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference model</td>
<td>GBSM NGSM NGSM GBSM GBSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fading generation</td>
<td>SoC SoC Doppler AR* SoFM filter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinusoid generation</td>
<td>LUT Iteration —— LUT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the method based on the autoregressive (AR) model [40]
summation of finite frequency modulation signals, namely SoFM method. The time-variant frequency and phase in (38) can be calculated by
\[
f_{n,m}(t') = \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( u_{n,m,MS} \sin(\theta_{n,m,MS}(t')) \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(t')) + u_{n,m,BS} \sin(\theta_{n,m,BS}(t')) \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(t')) + u_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}} \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(t')) \right)
\]
and
\[
\Theta_{u,s,n,m}(l) = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \left( d_{MS,u} \sin(\theta_{n,m,MS}(l)) \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(l)) + d_{BS,u} \sin(\theta_{n,m,BS}(l)) \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(l)) + d_{MS,s} \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(l)) \cdot \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \sin(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) \cdot \sin(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) \right).
\]

Let us take a 2×2 MIMO channel as an example, the architecture of our non-stationary channel emulator is presented in Fig. 3. It includes three principle modules: the parameters module, the generation module, and the combination module. The first module updates time-variant channel parameters via aforementioned evolving algorithms or pre-stored calculation results, the second module generates channel coefficients and implements the convolution algorithm by time division (TD) scheme, and the third module carries out matrix operations accordingly, they would take up most of hardware resources. Considering the fact that maximum Doppler frequency in the real world is much smaller than the sampling rate, we can use a lower sampling rate \(f'_s\) to generate the original channel coefficients inside the TD-SoFM module. In addition, the TD method is also adopted to reduce hardware consumptions as showed in Fig. 4. All \(M\) sub-paths share one data path, including the instantaneous phase calculation and look-up table (LUT) of cosine functions, in the generation of multiple FM signals. All signals are summed up by an ACC to obtain the channel coefficients of one path. Here, the rate of sub-path data stream and the output of the accumulator are \(MNf'_s\) and \(Nf'_s\), respectively. Finally, in order to match the data rate of TD multipliers, the channel coefficients \(\hat{h}_{n,s,u}(l), n = 1, 2, ..., N\) are interpolated by \(f_s/f'_s\) by the cascade integrator comb (CIC) filters. In addition, the frequencies and phases in SoFM modules are both time-variant, the recursive algorithm in [36] cannot be used to calculate the cosine function. In this paper, we choose the LUT method, but only the first quarter cycle of cosine samples (256 bytes) are pre-stored in ROM for the symmetry of cosine function.

\[f_{n,m}(t') = \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( u_{n,m,MS} \sin(\theta_{n,m,MS}(t')) \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(t')) + u_{n,m,BS} \sin(\theta_{n,m,BS}(t')) \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(t')) + u_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}} \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(t')) \right)\]

\[\Theta_{u,s,n,m}(l) = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \left( d_{MS,u} \sin(\theta_{n,m,MS}(l)) \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(l)) + d_{BS,u} \sin(\theta_{n,m,BS}(l)) \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(l)) + d_{MS,s} \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(l)) \cdot \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \sin(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) \cdot \sin(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) \right)\]

\[f_{n,m}(t') = \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( u_{n,m,MS} \sin(\theta_{n,m,MS}(t')) \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(t')) + u_{n,m,BS} \sin(\theta_{n,m,BS}(t')) \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(t')) + u_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}} \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(t')) \right)\]

\[\Theta_{u,s,n,m}(l) = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \left( d_{MS,u} \sin(\theta_{n,m,MS}(l)) \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(l)) + d_{BS,u} \sin(\theta_{n,m,BS}(l)) \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(l)) + d_{MS,s} \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(l)) \cdot \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \sin(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) \cdot \sin(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) \right)\]

\[f_{n,m}(t') = \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( u_{n,m,MS} \sin(\theta_{n,m,MS}(t')) \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(t')) + u_{n,m,BS} \sin(\theta_{n,m,BS}(t')) \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(t')) + u_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}} \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(t')) \right)\]

\[\Theta_{u,s,n,m}(l) = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \left( d_{MS,u} \sin(\theta_{n,m,MS}(l)) \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(l)) + d_{BS,u} \sin(\theta_{n,m,BS}(l)) \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(l)) + d_{MS,s} \cos(\phi_{n,m,MS}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \sin(\phi_{n,m,BS}(l)) \cdot \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \sin(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) \cdot \sin(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) + d_{BS,s} \cos(\phi_{n,m,\hat{\lambda}}(l)) \right)\]

C. Resource consumption

As an example, we have implemented a non-stationary 2×2 channel model in a single Xilinx FPGA chip (Kintex-7KC705) by the hardware description language. Because most of hardware consumptions are caused by TD-SoFM modules, Table III summarizes the utilization of hardware resource for one TD-SoFM module. The final data clock \(N_{max}\) is 200 MHz with \(M = 20\), \(N_{max} = 32\), and the interpolation number is fixed to 100. Thus, the original sample rate \(f'_s\) of each sub-path is 62.5 KHz, which means that the maximum Doppler frequency supported is up to 31.25 KHz. Moreover, the selected FPGA (XC7K325TFFG900-2L) consists of about 445 Block RAMs (36 Kb each), 840 DSP slices, and 203800 LUTs. Based on the resource usage of one TD-SoFM module,
it can also be estimated that a $4 \times 4$ MIMO channel with twenty multi-paths for each channel can be emulated on this single chip.

V. HARDWARE MEASUREMENT RESULTS AND VALIDATION

A. Time-variant Doppler frequency

In order to verify the time-variant Doppler frequency of our proposed non-stationary GBSTM intuitively, we consider a condition that the number of paths and rays are both equal to one ($N(t) = M = 1$). Meanwhile, this single path is assumed to be valid in the period of simulation time. The MS and interacted clusters $\Lambda_1$ and $Z_1$ are fixed on the horizontal plan and move along the positive $x$-axis with angles of $0$, $\pi/4$, and $\pi/6$, respectively. The carrier frequency is $f_c = 2.4$ GHz, and other simulation parameters are configured as follows, $D_{BS, A_1}(t_0) = 20$ m, $D_{Z_1, MS}(t_0) = 40$ m, $D_{LOS}(t_0) = 100$ m, $\|\vec{v}_{MS}\| = 60$ km/h, $\|\vec{v}_A\| = 5$ km/h, and $\|\vec{v}_Z\| = 5$ km/h, $\|\vec{v}_{A_1}\|$ and $\|\vec{v}_{Z_1}\| \sim U(0, 10)$ km/h. With the help of (5)–(7), the theoretical values of Doppler frequency at any time can be obtained and shown in Fig. 5 (a). Notice that the maximum absolute value of (5) can be reached only when the received signal and the relative velocity have the same or opposite direction, and it equals to 123.84 Hz. This situation is only fulfilled when the distance between the MS and cluster becomes far enough, which can also be observed at the end of simulation time in Fig. 5 (a). The simulated results of the proposed model and conventional models in [17], [21], [22] are compared in Fig. 5 (b). In addition, the measured result of hardware emulator by using a spectrum analyzer (Agilent N9340B) is given in Fig. 5 (c). In the measurement, the input signal of hardware emulator is a 2.4 GHz carrier signal generated by a signal generator (Agilent E4438C), and thus the output frequency offset represents the effect of Doppler frequency. As in Figs. 5 (b) and (c) that the Doppler frequency of our channel model fits the theoretical one quite well and the maximum absolute value is 123.5 Hz.

However, the Doppler frequency of conventional models cannot achieve the proper result and the maximum absolute value is over 181 Hz, which can lead to unpredictable problems in real applications. In addition, Fig. 5 (d) shows the corresponding time-variant phase caused by the Doppler frequency for the proposed model. For comparison purposes, the results of conventional models are also given in Fig. 5 (d). It is clearly shown that the output phase of our proposed model is more smooth and accurate than those of conventional models. The reason is that the output Doppler frequency of conventional models is not accurate as illustrated in (24), which is verified by simulations as shown in Figs. 5 (a) – (c).

B. Time-variant ACF and CCF

To verify statistical properties of our hardware emulator, we set the measurement scenario as C2-NLoS [29]. The birth rate, death rate, the percentage of movement, and the carrier frequency are $\lambda_C = 0.8$ /m, $\lambda_R = 0.04$ /m, $P_c = 0.3$, and $f_c = 2.4$ GHz. Since the measurement results of any path are similar, we only test the first path. The rest of main channel parameters are as follows, $D_{BS, A_1}(t_0) = 20$ m, $D_{Z_1, MS}(t_0) = 40$ m, $D_{LOS}(t_0) = 100$ m, $\|\vec{v}_{MS}\| = 40$ km/h, $\|\vec{v}_A\| = 1$ km/h, and $\|\vec{v}_Z\| = 1$ km/h. $\|\vec{v}_{A_1}\|$ and $\|\vec{v}_{Z_1}\| \sim U(0, 2)$ km/h. By using (32)–(33) with $u = s = 1$ and $n = 1$, the absolute value of the 3D time-variant theoretical ACF is calculated and given in Fig. 6 (a). It is noticed that the ACF change over time due to time-variant channel parameters. With the help of integrated software environment (ISE), we store and export the raw data of channel coefficients from the hardware emulator. Then, the data is analyzed by Matlab according to the definition of (27). The final results of the measured ACFs at different time instants $t = 0$ s, 3 s, and 7 s are showed in Fig. 6 (b). For comparison purposes, the theoretical ACFs at these time instants are extracted from Fig. 6 (a) and plotted in Fig. 6 (b) as well. It shows that the measured ACFs provide a quite good approximation to the corresponding theoretical ones, especially in small time lags. This demonstrates the correctness of the derivations of (32)–(33). Moreover, another important statistical parameter of fading channel, i.e., coherence time, defined as the minimum time lag of $|p_n(t, \Delta t_{min})| = 0.5$, can also be obtained directly from Figs. 6 (a) and (b). It can be found that the coherence time is time-variant and within the range of 3 ms to 7 ms under this scenario.

Under the same scenario, by using (35) with $u_1 = s_1 = 1$ and $n = 1$, the absolute value of time-variant theoretical CCF is also calculated and given in Fig. 7 (a). In this figure, we assume that the antenna spaces on the BS and MS are the same, and the $y$ axis denotes the antenna space normalized.
by the half wavelength. Then, the output CCF of hardware emulator can be measured by a similar method. Fig. 7 (b) compares the theoretical and measured CCFs at three time instants, i.e., $t = 0\,\text{s}, 3\,\text{s},$ and $7\,\text{s}$. From Figs. 7 (a) and (b), we can see that the cross-correlation drops quickly and reaches a relatively low level when the normalized antenna space beyond 0.5. Since the cross-correlation of the signals received by different antennas will degrade the performance of MIMO systems, this observation will help us to optimize the layout of antenna arrays. Again, the well matched theoretical and measured results validate the correctness of hardware implementation, as well as the derivations of (34)–(35).

**C. Time-variant DPSD**

In order to verify the hardware emulator, B4 and B1 scenarios in [29] are also tested. With the help of (36), the theoretical results of time-variant DPSDs under these two scenarios are given in Fig. 8 (a) and Fig. 9 (a), respectively. For verifying the hardware emulator, we used Agilent E4438C to generate a 2.4 GHz carrier signal as the stimulation signal, and then observed the output signal of the first path by Agilent N9340B. The measured DPSDs are shown in Fig. 8 (b) and Fig. 9 (b), respectively. Since the measured DPSDs cannot be exactly the same as theoretical ones due to randomness, the validation is usually qualitative [40]. In addition, the theoretical results in Fig. 8 (a) and Fig. 9 (a) do not include the impact of carrier signal, so we only need to compare the trends and shapes of these two sorts of PSDs. From Fig. 8 (b) and Fig. 9 (b), it is clear that the trends and shapes of the measured DPSDs are very similar to the corresponding theoretical ones in Fig. 8 (a) and Fig. 9 (a). Moreover, both of them clearly demonstrate the birth and death procedure of each path over time. Though the DPSD test was only undertaken for the above two scenarios, it proves the effectiveness of the proposed 3D non-stationary GBSM, as well as the hardware implementation.

**VI. CONCLUSIONS**

This paper has proposed a new 3D non-stationary GBSM for MIMO channels, which can capture the time-variant small-scale fading characteristics caused by the movements of the MS and scatterers. The update algorithms of time-variant channel parameters, such as the number of paths, delays, powers, AoD and AoA, have also been analyzed in details. Meanwhile, a universal correlation function of non-stationary channel models,
as well as two application cases of ACF and CCF, has been derived. Since the calculation of accumulated phase caused by Doppler effects is upgraded in our model, these theoretical results have been improved compared with those of existing models. Furthermore, on the basis of the proposed model, a new efficient hardware implementation method with a compact hardware architecture has been presented and implemented. Finally, simulation results have validated that our model can accurately reproduce the time-variant Doppler frequency of the underlying wireless channels. Hardware measurement results have also demonstrated that statistical properties such as ACF, CCF, and DSPD agree well with the corresponding theoretical ones. Therefore, the presented non-stationary GBSM as well as the hardware emulator can be applied to evaluate future wireless MIMO systems. Note that many latest millimeter wave channel models, i.e., METIS channel model [10], 3GPP TR 38.901 channel model [11], and mmMAGIC channel model [45], adopt the similar frame work of WINNER+ channel model. In the future work, we will extend our proposed non-stationary GBSM as well as the hardware emulator can be applied to evaluate future wireless MIMO systems.

APPENDIX A

Derivation of (23)

Let us assume that $D_{BS,A_n}$, $\phi_n^{A_{AoD}}$, $\theta_n^{E_{AoD}}(t_0)$, $\theta_{A_n}$, and $\|\vec{v}_{A_n}\|$ can be obtained from a measurement campaign or generated randomly at initial stage.

**Case A.1:** $0 \leq \theta_n^{E_{AoD}}(t_0) \leq \pi/2$

In this case, $\theta_n^{E_{AoD}}(t)$ can be defined by

$$\theta_n^{E_{AoD}}(t) = \arctan \left\{ \frac{D_{BS,A_n}(t) \cdot \sin \theta_n^{E_{AoD}}(t)}{D_{BS,A_n}(t_0) \cdot \cos \theta_n^{E_{AoD}}(t_0)} \right\}. \quad (41)$$

With the law of cosines, we can obtain (42), where $\beta$ can be expressed as

$$\beta = \pi - \theta_{A_n} + \phi_n^{A_{AoD}}(t_0). \quad (43)$$

Substituting (42) and (43) into (41), we can rewrite $\theta_n^{E_{AoD}}(t)$ in (41) as (22).a.


IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON COMMUNICATIONS, VOL. XX, NO. XX, APRIL 2018


Fig. 8. (a) Theoretical and (b) measured time-variant DPSDs of the first path of the proposed 3D non-stationary GBSM (B4 scenario, $f_c = 2.4$ GHz, $D_{BS,A_n}(t_0) = 20$ m, $D_{Z_{n,MS}}(t_0) = 40$ m, $D_{LOS}(t_0) = 100$ m, $\|\vec{v}_{MS}\| = 60$ km/h, $\|\vec{v}_A\| = 1$ km/h, $\|\vec{v}_Z\| = 1$ km/h).

Fig. 9. (a) Theoretical and (b) measured time-variant DPSDs of the first path of the proposed 3D non-stationary GBSM (B1 scenario, $f_c = 2.4$ GHz, $D_{BS,A_n}(t_0) = 20$ m, $D_{Z_{n,MS}}(t_0) = 40$ m, $D_{LOS}(t_0) = 100$ m, $\|\vec{v}_{MS}\| = 60$ km/h, $\|\vec{v}_A\| = 1$ km/h, $\|\vec{v}_Z\| = 1$ km/h).

In this case, $\theta_{EAOd}^{B_n}(t)$ can be defined by

$$\theta_{EAOd}^{B_n}(t) = \arctan\left(\frac{D_{BS,A_n}(t) \cdot \sin \theta_{EAOd}^{B_n}(t)}{D_{BS,A_n}(t_0) \cdot \cos \theta_{EAOd}^{B_n}(t_0)}\right). \quad (44)$$

Substituting (42) and (43) into (44), we can obtain $\theta_{EAOd}^{B_n}(t)$ as (22).b.
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