

Pairwise Node Localization From Differences in Their UWB Channels to Observer Nodes

Gregor Dumphart, Robin Kramer, Robert Heyn, Marc Kuhn, and Armin Wittneben

Abstract—We consider the problem of localization and distance estimation between a pair of wireless nodes in a multipath propagation environment, but not the usual way of processing a channel measurement between them. We propose a novel paradigm which compares the two nodes' ultra-wideband (UWB) channels to *other* nodes, called *observers*. The key principle is that the channel impulse responses (CIRs) are similar at small inter-node distance d and differ increasingly with increasing d . We present distance estimators which utilize the rich location information contained in the *delay differences* of extracted multipath components (MPCs). Likewise, we present estimators for the relative position vector which process both MPC delays and MPC directions. We do so for various important cases: with and without clock synchronization, delay measurement errors, and knowledge of the MPC association between the two CIRs. The estimators exhibit great technological advantages: they do not require precise time-synchronization, line-of-sight conditions, or knowledge about the observer locations or the environment. We study the estimation accuracy with a numerical evaluation based on random sampling and, additionally, with an experimental evaluation based on measurements in an indoor environment. The proposal shows the potential for great accuracy in theory and practice. Integrating the paradigm into existing localization algorithms and systems could enable low-cost localization of wireless users or networks in dynamic multipath settings.

Index Terms—ultra-wideband ranging, distance estimation, relative localization, indoor localization, synchronization

I. INTRODUCTION

WIRELESS localization is the task of estimating a node's position from wireless channel measurements. It is a key requirement for many current or desired mobile applications in the Internet of Things, wireless sensor networks, robotics, and satellite navigation. Thereby, great accuracy and reliability are desired. Important use cases concern indoor environments (retail stores [3], access gates [4], assisted living [5], public transport, warehouses), crowded urban settings [6] and large events [7], vehicular use cases [8], disaster sites, and forests. The related problem of wireless ranging (i.e. distance estimation) has received a lot of interest in the context of autonomous driving, keyless entry systems [9], access control

[4], and social distance monitoring for contact tracing in pandemic disease control [10]–[13].

These applications concern dense and dynamic propagation environments, characterized by time-variant channels with frequent line-of-sight (LOS) obstruction [14] and rich multipath propagation. This poses a great challenge to wireless localization and ranging. Distance estimates obtained from the received signal strength (RSS) tend to have large relative error as shadowing, antenna patterns, and small-scale fading cause large RSS fluctuations [15], [16]. Time of arrival (TOA) distance estimates, which can be obtained with wideband or ultra-wideband (UWB) systems, often have a substantial bias as a result of LOS obstruction, synchronization errors, processing delays, and multipath interference [17]–[20]. This causes large relative errors at short distances. Naturally, trilateration of such inaccurate distance estimates will result in inaccurate position estimates. Alleviating this problem by ensuring enough anchors in LOS to all relevant mobile positions is often infeasible or very costly [5]. Location fingerprinting is also not an all-round alternative for accurate localization; the training data and the associated acquisition effort are quickly rendered obsolete by time-varying channels [21], [22].

State-of-the-art localization systems deal with these problems with methods such as soft information processing [23], [24] and temporal filtering [4], [25], [26] with the incorporation of inertial measurements [4]. Various recent work [5], [14], [20], [26]–[29] considers multipath as opportunity rather than interference: multipath-assisted localization allows for accuracy improvements if knowledge about the propagation environment is either available a-priori [27] or obtained with mapping [26], [29]. Thereby, UWB operation is crucial for resolving individual multipath components (MPCs) of the channel [5], [30], [31]. Another promising aspect is the use of MPC direction information (e.g., the angle of arrival) which can be obtained with wideband antenna arrays, e.g., in millimeter-wave massive-MIMO systems that are expected to be commonplace soon [25], [32]. Further accuracy and robustness improvements are possible with cooperative (a.k.a. collaborative) network localization [25], [33]–[35], where distance information between multiple mobiles is used in an improved, joint position estimate. These developments show the relevance of relative location information between pairs of nodes and of embracing multipath propagation in the signal processing for wireless localization.

In this paper we propose and study an *alternative paradigm* for the estimation of the distance $d = \|\mathbf{d}\|$ or the relative position vector $\mathbf{d}$ between two nodes, with the goal of alleviating the outlined problems of wireless localization and ranging

This work was partially supported by Innosuisse, Switzerland under project number 18723.2 PFES-ES (CTI). This article was presented in part at the IEEE Conference on Communications, Shanghai, China, May 2019 [1], and has been submitted for presentation in part at the IEEE Global Communications Conference Workshops, Madrid, Spain, December 2021 [2].

G. Dumphart, R. Kramer, R. Heyn and A. Wittneben are with the Wireless Communications Group, D-ITET, ETH Zurich, Zürich, 8092 Switzerland, e-mail: dumphart@nari.ee.ethz.ch, robin.kramer@bluewin.ch, {heyne, wittneben}@nari.ee.ethz.ch.

M. Kuhn is with the Zurich University of Applied Sciences (ZHAW), Winterthur, 8400 Switzerland, e-mail: kumn@zhaw.ch.

systems. First of all, we abandon the conventional notion that an estimate of the distance d between two nodes A and B should be based on a direct measurement such as the TOA or RSS between them (Fig. 1a). Instead, we consider the presence of one or more *other* nodes, henceforth referred to as *observers* $o \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ (Fig. 1b). We consider the channel impulse responses (CIRs) $h_o^{(A)}(\tau)$ between node A and the observers as well as the CIRs $h_o^{(B)}(\tau)$ between node B and the observers. These CIRs can be obtained via channel estimation at the




Fig. 1. Conventional versus proposed paradigm for relative localization of two wireless nodes.

observers after transmitting training sequences at A and B, or vice versa [30]. The CIRs are descriptive signatures of the multipath environment, if measured with sufficient bandwidth [5]. Our starting point is the observation that a CIR $h_o^{(A)}(\tau)$ is similar to $h_o^{(B)}(\tau)$ for small distances d but *differ increasingly and systematically* with increasing d . A good metric for CIR dissimilarity could give rise to an accurate estimate of d or even of the relative position vector $\mathbf{d}$, with the prospect of particularly good accuracy at short distances and no requirements for LOS connections.

The realization of such an estimation rule is a major open question. One option is regression via machine learning, e.g., training a neural network with a large set of ground-truth values d or $\mathbf{d}$ and the associated CIRs (obtained by measurement or simulation). This onerous approach would however hardly allow for analytic insights and will struggle with time-varying channels.

Contribution: Using estimation theory and geometric principles, we derive estimators that process the geometric information in MPCs according to the proposed paradigm (delineated in Fig. 1c). Specifically, we state closed-form distance estimators $\hat{d}$ from the difference of MPC delays and, furthermore, relative position estimators $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ which additionally process the MPC directions at the nodes A and/or B. To the best of our knowledge, neither the proposed paradigm nor any of the presented associated estimators are covered by existing work. Our specific contributions are:

- Regarding *distance estimation*, we derive the *maximum-likelihood* estimate (MLE) under random delay mea-

surement errors and random MPC directions (assuming a uniform distribution in 3D). We also derive the MLE for the case of unknown MPC association, the minimum-variance unbiased estimate (MVUE) for the zero-measurement-error case, and its scaling behavior.

- Regarding *relative position estimation* when the MPC directions are observable, we derive MLE and least-squares estimate (LSE) results for various cases. We append a tailored scheme for MPC association.
- We *demonstrate good accuracy* for indoor environments:
 - By simulation, using random sampling of MPCs.
 - In practice, based on acquired UWB channel measurements over a trajectory in a large room.
- We identify *technological advantages* of the estimators: they do not require LOS conditions, precise time-synchronization, or knowledge about the environment or the observer locations (other mobiles can be observers).
- We identify the *important use cases* of social distance estimation, proximity testing (e.g., access gates) and pairwise estimation for cooperative network localization.

Paper Structure: In Sec. II we state the employed system model, geometric properties, and assumptions on synchronization and MPC extraction. Sec. III and IV present the derived estimators for node distance and relative position, respectively. The numerical and practical performance evaluations are given in Sec. V and VI, respectively. Sec. VII discusses the accuracy, technological advantages, and application potential of the paradigm. Sec. VIII concludes the paper.

Notation: Scalars x are written lowercase italic, vectors $\mathbf{x}$ lowercase boldface, and matrices $\mathbf{X}$ uppercase boldface. $\mathbf{I}_K$ is the $K \times K$ identity matrix. All vectors are column vectors unless transposed explicitly. $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ is the Euclidean norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$. For a random variable x , the probability density function (PDF) is denoted as $f_x(x)$ and the cumulative distribution function (CDF) as $F_x(x)$. For simplicity we do not use distinct random variable notation. $\mathbb{E}[x]$ is the expected value of x .

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND KEY PRINCIPLES

The positions of nodes A and B are written in Cartesian coordinates $\mathbf{p}^{(A)}, \mathbf{p}^{(B)} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ in an arbitrary reference frame. The position of node B relative to node A is characterized by:

$$\text{relative position: } \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{p}^{(B)} - \mathbf{p}^{(A)}, \quad \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{node distance: } d = \|\mathbf{p}^{(B)} - \mathbf{p}^{(A)}\|, \quad d \in \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (2)$$

We consider the observers $o \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ with $M \geq 1$. The multipath channels between the observers and node A are characterized by the CIRs $h_o^{(A)}(\tau)$ and those between the observers and node B by $h_o^{(B)}(\tau)$. We require that the same set of MPCs is extracted from both $h_o^{(A)}(\tau)$ and $h_o^{(B)}(\tau)$. This is easily fulfilled in practice for small d and distinct MPCs. Large d , diffuse multipath, selective MPC occurrence and limited bandwidth will however pose challenges. The number K_o of extracted MPCs is left as an unspecified design parameter. The MPCs may or may not comprise the LOS path and reflected, scattered, or diffracted paths. For an introduction to UWB

multipath channels and the extraction of MPCs refer to [5], [30], [31]. The employed indices are:

$$\text{observer index: } o \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}, \quad (3)$$

$$\text{MPC index: } k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K_o\}, \quad (4)$$

$$\text{total MPC count: } K = K_1 + \dots + K_M. \quad (5)$$

We consider the following MPC parameters:

$$\text{MPC delay, true value: } \bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}, \bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)} \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad (6)$$

$$\text{MPC delay, measured: } \tau_{ko}^{(A)}, \tau_{ko}^{(B)} \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad (7)$$

$$\text{delay difference, true value: } \bar{\Delta}_{ko} = \bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)} - \bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)} \quad (8)$$

$$\text{delay difference, measured: } \Delta_{ko} = \tau_{ko}^{(B)} - \tau_{ko}^{(A)} \quad (9)$$

$$\text{MPC direction (unit vectors): } \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}, \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \quad (10)$$

Specifically, $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}, \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ are the directions of arrival at $\mathbf{p}^{(A)}, \mathbf{p}^{(B)}$ if an observer is transmitting (see Fig. 2a). Vice versa, $-\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ and $-\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ would be the directions of departure at $\mathbf{p}^{(A)}, \mathbf{p}^{(B)}$ if A, B were transmitting. We do not define the transmitter and receiver roles due to channel reciprocity.




Fig. 2. Considered wireless setup in an exemplary indoor environment with two walls, one observer ($M = 1$), and $K_o = 3$ propagation paths. Here, $k = 1$ is the LOS path and $k \in \{2, 3\}$ are reflections. The CIR illustration assumes a raised-cosine pulse of 2 GHz bandwidth and no noise or interference.

We recall that a delay τ is caused by having traveled a path length $c\tau$ at the wave propagation velocity $c \approx 3 \cdot 10^8$ m/s (the speed of light). Therefrom, we establish crucial *geometric properties* regarding MPC dissimilarity between the two sets of CIRs. Each MPC k, o fulfills the delay-difference bounds

$$-d \leq c\bar{\Delta}_{ko} \leq d \quad (11)$$

and, furthermore, two equalities on the relative position vector:

$$\mathbf{d} = c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} - c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}, \quad (12)$$

$$(\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} + \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)})^T \mathbf{d} = c\bar{\Delta}_{ko}(1 + (\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)})^T \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}). \quad (13)$$

In Appendix A we give a simple proof based on the triangle between $\mathbf{p}^{(A)}, \mathbf{p}^{(B)}$, and the virtual source of the MPC k, o .

If $d \ll c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}$, $d \ll c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)}$, and the MPC is not caused by a scatterer near A and B, then $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} \approx \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ holds. In consequence

$$(\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)})^T \mathbf{d} \approx (\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)})^T \mathbf{d} \approx c\bar{\Delta}_{ko} \quad (14)$$

holds in good approximation. This is essentially a plane-wave assumption (PWA) in the vicinity of node A and B. It constitutes a simpler version of (13).

We believe that the mathematical structure in (12) to (14) is fundamentally responsible for successes in wideband MIMO location fingerprinting, e.g. reported in [36], [37]. In this paper we will utilize these properties systematically in the formulation of estimators. A key strength is the formal absence of the observer positions and environment specifics in the expressions. The bounds (11) show that the value range of $\{c\Delta_{ko}\}$ is expressive of d , which will be utilized by the distance estimators in Sec. III. Likewise, (12) to (14) will be utilized by the relative position estimators in Sec. IV. We note that equation (12) readily provides an estimation rule for vector $\mathbf{d}$ from the delay and direction of a single MPC, if accurate measurements thereof can actually be obtained.

For the measured MPC delays we consider the error model

$$\tau_{ko}^{(A)} = \bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)} + n_{ko}^{(A)} + \epsilon_o^{(A)}, \quad (15)$$

$$\tau_{ko}^{(B)} = \bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)} + n_{ko}^{(B)} + \epsilon_o^{(B)} \quad (16)$$

where $n_{ko}^{(A)}, n_{ko}^{(B)}$ are measurement errors due to noise, interference, clock jitter, and limited bandwidth and receiver resolution [17], [30]. The clock offsets $\epsilon_o^{(A)}$ between A and o and $\epsilon_o^{(B)}$ between B and o occur because we do not assume precise time-synchronization, neither between A and B nor between the observers. However, we assume that the setup is able to conduct the necessary channel estimation steps in quick succession, such that the clock drift is negligible over the duration of the entire process (i.e. while recording all the received signals).¹ A consequence is the property

$$\epsilon_o^{(B)} - \epsilon_o^{(A)} = \epsilon \quad (17)$$

for the clock offset ϵ between A and B, which specifically does not depend on the observer index o . This property yields a particularly simple *signal model* for the measured delay differences Δ_{ko} from (9),

$$\Delta_{ko} = \bar{\Delta}_{ko} + n_{ko} + \epsilon. \quad (18)$$

The measurement error $n_{ko} = n_{ko}^{(B)} - n_{ko}^{(A)}, n_{ko} \in \mathbb{R}$ is considered as a random variable. We note that potential biases are compensated by the difference. It could thus be reasonable to assume $\mathbb{E}[n_{ko}] = 0$. Likewise, a Gaussian-distributed n_{ko} could be a reasonable assumption because of the many different influences in $n_{ko}^{(B)} - n_{ko}^{(A)}$ (central limit theorem). The clock offset $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ is considered as non-random variable. We distinguish between the asynchronous case where ϵ is unknown and the synchronous case where ϵ is a-priori known.

Furthermore, we distinguish between the cases of a-priori known association and unknown association between the MPCs extracted from $h_o^{(A)}(\tau)$ and from $h_o^{(B)}(\tau)$. The significance of this distinction is apparent in Fig. 2b, where

¹Even without this no-clock-drift assumption, the estimator results of this paper apply with straightforward adaptations. These are given in Appendix E.

$\bar{\tau}_{2,o}^{(A)} < \bar{\tau}_{3,o}^{(A)}$ while $\bar{\tau}_{3,o}^{(B)} < \bar{\tau}_{2,o}^{(B)}$. This shows that the delay order need not comply with the MPC association. This is to be expected unless d/c is much smaller than the delay spread. Estimating the MPC association is a delicate signal processing problem when the path delays and amplitudes are the only available MPC-identifying features. Related work can be found in [5] for temporal tracking and in [38], [39] for a single temporal snapshot. On the other hand, MPC association can be trivial if d is a-priori known to be small. The correct association of the CIRs to A and B and to the observers is always assumed, as it can easily be established by a protocol.

III. DISTANCE ESTIMATORS

This section presents estimators of the inter-node distance d from measured delay differences $\Delta_{ko} = \bar{\Delta}_{ko} + n_{ko} + \epsilon$ as defined in (18). The estimators do not use or require the MPC directions. In order to derive estimators with desirable estimation-theoretic properties, we have to establish an adequate statistical model for Δ_{ko} . We achieve this with the following assumptions regarding rich multipath propagation:

- I: Each MPC direction $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is random and has uniform distribution on the 3D unit sphere.
- II: The random directions $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ are statistically independent for different MPCs k, o .
- III: The plane-wave approximation (14) is assumed to be exact, i.e. $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} = \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ and $(\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)})^T \mathbf{d} = (\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)})^T \mathbf{d} = c\bar{\Delta}_{ko}$.

These assumptions actually result in i.i.d. uniform distributions $c\bar{\Delta}_{ko} \sim \mathcal{U}(-d, d)$. Details can be found in [40, Lemma 4.1].

For the measurement errors n_{ko} we assume the distribution to be known. For mathematical simplicity we assume statistical independence between the n_{ko} of different MPCs k, o .

The MPC association is assumed to be known (i.e. correctly established by a preceding signal processing step) in Sec. III-A and assumed unknown in Sec. III-B.

A. With Known MPC Association

Given the delay differences Δ_{ko} subject to measurement errors n_{ko} and unknown clock offset ϵ , we show in Appendix B that the joint maximum-likelihood estimate (MLE) of distance d and clock offset ϵ is given by the maximization problem

$$(\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}}, \hat{\epsilon}^{\text{MLE}}) \in \arg \max_{\substack{\tilde{d} \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tilde{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}}} \frac{1}{\tilde{d}^K} \prod_{o=1}^M \prod_{k=1}^{K_o} I_{ko}(\Delta_{ko} - \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{d}), \quad (19)$$

$$I_{ko}(\bullet, \tilde{d}) = F_{n_{ko}}\left(\bullet + \frac{\tilde{d}}{c}\right) - F_{n_{ko}}\left(\bullet - \frac{\tilde{d}}{c}\right). \quad (20)$$

The free variables $\tilde{d}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}$ represent hypothesis values and $F_{n_{ko}}$ is the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the measurement error n_{ko} . The inclusion of ϵ as nuisance parameter is mandatory because it affects the statistics of Δ_{ko} .

For the case of Gaussian errors $n_{ko} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{ko}^2)$, the CDF is described by the Q -function, $F_{n_{ko}}(x) = 1 - Q(x/\sigma_{ko})$. The term I_{ko} can be regarded as soft indicator function that evaluates the set membership $c(\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon) \in [-\tilde{d}, \tilde{d}]$. Fig. 3a and 3b show examples of the two-dimensional likelihood function, i.e. of the maximization objective function in (19). They concern the setup in Fig. 2a.




Fig. 3. Likelihood function of distance (abscissa) and clock offset (ordinate) given observed delay differences $\{\Delta_{ko}\}$, cf. (19). Shown are cases with and without MPC association and measurement errors (Gaussian distribution). The evaluation is done for the setup in Fig. 2 with the same CIRs with $K = 3$ and $d = 2.5$ m (also $\epsilon = 5$ ns is assumed).




Fig. 4. Likelihood function of distance, obtained by fixing the clock offset at the true value in (19) and Fig. 3. This requires precise time-synchronization between node A and B. The evaluation is done for the setup in Fig. 2.

A general closed-form solution of (19) is unavailable and the properties of the optimization problem depend on the specific error statistics. The likelihood function is non-concave in general. This applies also to the Gaussian case because the Q -function is neither convex nor concave. Yet, the Gaussian case exhibits a unimodal likelihood function that is infinitely differentiable (i.e. smooth) and, thus, (19) can easily be solved with a few iterations of a gradient-based numerical solver.²

In the time-synchronous case where the clock offset ϵ is a-priori known, the MLE $\hat{d}_{\text{sync}}^{\text{MLE}}$ is found by maximizing a now univariate likelihood function of distance, which is obtained by fixing $\tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon$ in (19). Examples thereof are given by the black graphs in Fig. 4.

Henceforth we consider the special case of zero measurement errors ($n_{ko} \equiv 0$). Here the actual indicator function $I_{ko}(\bullet, \tilde{d}) = \mathbb{1}_{[-\tilde{d}/c, \tilde{d}/c]}(\bullet)$ applies and, in consequence, the

²A detailed treatment of mathematical optimization aspects is out of scope and left for future work. This concerns concavity criteria for the likelihood function, other uniqueness criteria for its maxima, and detailed suggestions for numerical optimization algorithms and their initialization.

likelihood function attains a distinct structure with discontinuities. This can be seen in Fig. 3a and 4. The MLE problem can now be solved in closed form, which is conducted in detail in Appendix B. The solutions for the different cases constitute very simple formulas for distance estimation:³

$$\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}} = \frac{c}{2} \left(\max_{k,o} \Delta_{ko} - \min_{k,o} \Delta_{ko} \right), \quad (21)$$

$$\hat{d}_{\text{sync}}^{\text{MLE}} = c \cdot \max_{k,o} |\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon|. \quad (22)$$

Both are underestimates with probability 1 and thus biased. An underestimate $\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}} < d$ occurs unless two of the random MPC directions happen to coincide with the directions of $\mathbf{d}$ and $-\mathbf{d}$, respectively. Only then do the values $c\bar{\Delta}_{ko}$ attain their minimum and maximum possible values $\pm d$. An underestimate $\hat{d}_{\text{sync}}^{\text{MLE}} < d$ occurs unless one MPC direction coincides with the direction of $\mathbf{d}$ or of $-\mathbf{d}$.

In Appendix B-3 we derive bias-corrected versions of (21) and (22) and furthermore show that the results are in fact the minimum-variance unbiased estimate (MVUE) of the respective cases. They are given by

$$\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}} = \frac{K+1}{K-1} \cdot \frac{c}{2} \left(\max_{k,o} \Delta_{ko} - \min_{k,o} \Delta_{ko} \right), \quad (23)$$

$$\hat{\epsilon}^{\text{MVUE}} = \hat{\epsilon}^{\text{MLE}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\max_{k,o} \Delta_{ko} + \min_{k,o} \Delta_{ko} \right), \quad (24)$$

$$\hat{d}_{\text{sync}}^{\text{MVUE}} = \frac{K+1}{K} c \cdot \max_{k,o} |\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon|. \quad (25)$$

The clock offset estimator (24) could be useful in its own right, e.g. for distributed synchronization in dense multipath. It is both the MLE and the MVUE.

Despite $n_{ko} \equiv 0$ and the MVUE property, the estimators (23) to (25) exhibit a non-zero estimation error with probability 1. This is caused by the random effect of the unknown MPC directions. Due to the simple observation statistics $c\bar{\Delta}_{ko} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{U}(-d, d)$, an analytic study of the estimation-error statistics is possible. By applying properties of order statistics [41, Cpt. 12 & 13] to (23) to (25) we obtain for the estimators' root-mean-squared error (RMSE)

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}} - d)^2]} = d \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{(K+1)(K+2)}}, \quad (26)$$

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\epsilon}^{\text{MVUE}} - \epsilon)^2]} = \frac{d}{c} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{(K-1)(K+2)}}, \quad (27)$$

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\hat{d}_{\text{sync}}^{\text{MVUE}} - d)^2]} = d \frac{1}{\sqrt{K(K+2)}}. \quad (28)$$

We note that each RMSE is asymptotically proportional to d/K , thus exhibiting a linear increase with distance. The formulas suggest that considering more MPCs is an efficient means to reduce the RMSE (it may however jeopardize the

³The estimators (21), (22), (24) have the MLE property also for a two-dimensional system model where $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ has uniform distribution on the unit circle. The MVUE rules however do not transfer. The details are omitted.

Another fortunate aspect is that the plane-wave assumption $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} \approx \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ (assumption III) is practically superfluous here; the MPCs relevant to estimation fulfill it quite naturally. To see this, note that in (21), (22), (24) these MPCs have $c\bar{\Delta}_{ko}$ near $-d$ or d , so their $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ is near-colinear with $\pm \mathbf{d}$. Thus, these MPC directions remain near-constant when moving from $\mathbf{p}^{(A)}$ to $\mathbf{p}^{(B)}$.

requirement of a correctly established MPC association). We also find that, asymptotically, the distance RMSE reduces by a factor $\sqrt{2}$ through precise time-synchronization between A and B. The reason is that the synchronous-case estimator (25) is less dependent on diverse MPC directions than (23).

B. With Unknown MPC Association

We now assume that, for any given o , the association between the delays $\{\tau_{1,o}^{(A)}, \dots, \tau_{K_o,o}^{(A)}\}$ and $\{\tau_{1,o}^{(B)}, \dots, \tau_{K_o,o}^{(B)}\}$ is unavailable. A distance estimator now faces the problem that (without any prior knowledge) any MPC association is eligible. Hence, any conceivable delay-difference $\tau_{\pi(k),o}^{(B)} - \tau_{k,o}^{(A)}$ with any choice of permutation $k' = \pi(k)$ is eligible a-priori. We regard the permutation π (a bijective map from and to $\{1, \dots, K_o\}$) as a formal representation of MPC association.

Consider a sorting permutation which establishes the order $\tau_{k,o}^{(A)} < \tau_{l,o}^{(A)}$ iff $\tau_{\pi(k),o}^{(B)} < \tau_{\pi(l),o}^{(B)}$. This will likely be the correct association if d/c is much smaller than the channel delay spread, but this circumstance is a-priori unknown.

We adopt the statistical assumptions from the beginning of this section. In Appendix C we show with tools from order statistics that the joint MLE of distance d and clock offset ϵ is now given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{d}_{\text{N/A}}^{\text{MLE}}, \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{N/A}}^{\text{MLE}}) &\in \arg \max_{\tilde{d} \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tilde{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}} \\ \frac{1}{\tilde{d}^K} \prod_{o=1}^M \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_{K_o}} \prod_{k=1}^{K_o} I_{ko}(\tau_{\pi(k),o}^{(B)} - \tau_{k,o}^{(A)} - \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{d}) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

which uses the soft indicator function I_{ko} from (20). Fig. 3c and 3d show examples of the likelihood function, which now has a multimodal structure: it is a superposition of likelihood functions of the type in Fig. 3a and 3b for different π . The estimates can be computed by attempting to find the global solution of the optimization problem (29) with a numerical solver, e.g., an iterative gradient-based algorithm with a multistart approach. Each likelihood evaluation has combinatorial time complexity, which becomes prohibitive for large K_o .

Consider the case without measurement errors ($n_{ko} \equiv 0$). The likelihood function in (29) attains the distinct structure in Fig. 3c and (as shown in Appendix C-3) the simpler MLE rule

$$(\hat{d}_{\text{N/A}}^{\text{MLE}}, \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{N/A}}^{\text{MLE}}) \in \arg \max_{(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}) \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{\tilde{d}^K} \prod_{o=1}^M C_o(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}) \quad (30)$$

applies. Here $C_o \in \mathbb{N}_0$ counts the eligible permutations given hypotheses $\tilde{d}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}$ and the observed delays. Formally,

$$C_o = \left| \left\{ \pi \in \Pi_{K_o} \mid c \cdot \max_k |\tau_{\pi(k),o}^{(B)} - \tau_{k,o}^{(A)} - \tilde{\epsilon}| \leq \tilde{d} \right\} \right|. \quad (31)$$

Due to the specific likelihood function structure, it suffices to evaluate the likelihood for a finite set of candidate hypotheses $(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}) \in \mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H} = \{(c \frac{L-S}{2}, \frac{L+S}{2}) \mid (L, S) \in \bigcup_{o=1}^M \mathcal{L}_o \times \mathcal{S}_o\}$ with the delay differences $\mathcal{L}_o = \bigcup_{\pi \in \Pi_{K_o}} \max_k \tau_{\pi(k),o}^{(B)} - \tau_{k,o}^{(A)}$ and $\mathcal{S}_o = \bigcup_{\pi \in \Pi_{K_o}} \min_k \tau_{\pi(k),o}^{(B)} - \tau_{k,o}^{(A)}$.

In the synchronous case, the MLE becomes the one-dimensional problem $\hat{d}_{\text{sync,N/A}}^{\text{MLE}} = \hat{d}_{\text{N/A}}^{\text{MLE}}|_{\tilde{\epsilon}=\epsilon}$. The red graphs in Fig. 4 show examples of the associated likelihood function,

which again shows a superposition of known-association-type likelihoods for different permutations. If furthermore $n_{ko} \equiv 0$, then the candidates for maximum-likelihood distance reduce to the finite set $\tilde{d} \in \bigcup_{o=1}^M \bigcup_{\pi \in \Pi_{K_o}} c \cdot \max_k |\tau_{\pi(k),o}^{(B)} - \tau_{k,o}^{(A)} - \epsilon|$.

IV. RELATIVE POSITION ESTIMATORS

This section presents estimators for the relative position vector $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{p}^{(B)} - \mathbf{p}^{(A)}$. These estimators do use the MPC directions $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}, \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ and thus require their availability, e.g., by measuring them during channel estimation with the use of antenna arrays at A and B. The estimators in Sec. IV-A furthermore use the MPC delay differences Δ_{ko} while those in Sec. IV-B use the MPC delays $\tau_{ko}^{(A)}$ and $\tau_{ko}^{(B)}$ directly. The two methods will result in characteristic differences.

Please note that inaccurately measured $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}, \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ can dominate the estimation error. This is not captured by the following formalism but will be investigated numerically in Sec. V.

The estimators assume that the MPC association was established correctly by a preceding signal processing step, e.g., by the scheme presented later in Sec. IV-C.

A. Position Estimates From Delay Differences

The considered approach is based on the projection property (13) and the processing of delay differences Δ_{ko} . As preparation, we define stacked vector and matrix quantities:

$$\Delta = [\Delta_{1,1} \dots \Delta_{K_1,1} \quad \Delta_{1,2} \dots \Delta_{K_M,M}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times 1}, \quad (32)$$

$$\mathbf{n} = [n_{1,1} \dots n_{K_1,1} \quad n_{1,2} \dots n_{K_M,M}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times 1}, \quad (33)$$

$$\mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s}_{1,1} \dots \mathbf{s}_{K_1,1} & \mathbf{s}_{1,2} \dots \mathbf{s}_{K_M,M} \\ 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times K}, \quad (34)$$

$$\mathbf{s}_{ko} = \frac{1}{1 + (\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)T} \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)})} (\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} + \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}. \quad (35)$$

The vector $\mathbf{s}_{ko}$ fulfills $\mathbf{s}_{ko}^T \mathbf{d} = c \bar{\Delta}_{ko}$, which is a handy restatement of (13). Therewith, the delay-differences signal model (18) can now handily be written as $\Delta = \bar{\Delta} + \mathbf{1}\epsilon + \mathbf{n}$ or rather as linear equation system $c\Delta = \mathbf{E}^T[\mathbf{d}^T, c\epsilon]^T + \mathbf{n}$.

We consider the joint estimation problem of $\mathbf{d}$ and ϵ after observing Δ subject to measurement error $\mathbf{n}$ and observing the MPC directions $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}, \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ without error (by assumption). In Appendix D-1 we show that the MLE is given by the unconstrained four-dimensional optimization problem

$$(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{MLE}}, \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{MLE}}) \in \arg \max_{\substack{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}}} f_{\mathbf{n}} \left(\Delta - \frac{1}{c} \mathbf{E}^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d} \\ c \cdot \tilde{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (36)$$

where $f_{\mathbf{n}}$ is the joint PDF of the measurement errors. This could be tackled with established numerical methods, e.g., an iterative gradient search. The properties of the likelihood function (e.g., concavity) depend on the specifics of $f_{\mathbf{n}}$.

The least-squares estimates (LSE) is given by the formula

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}} \\ c \cdot \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}} \end{bmatrix} = (\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T)^{-1} \mathbf{E}(c\Delta). \quad (37)$$

Conveniently, the LSE can be computed without knowledge of the statistics of $\mathbf{n}$. For the special case $\mathbf{n} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_K)$, the LSE (37) is also the MLE and the MVUE. For a general Gaussian distribution $\mathbf{n} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, the MLE and MVUE

is instead given by $(\mathbf{E}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{E}^T)^{-1}\mathbf{E}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(c\Delta - c\boldsymbol{\mu})$, which deviates from the LSE in general. [42, Thm 4.2 and Thm 7.5].

If the clock offset ϵ between A and B is known (synchronous case) then $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}}$ is obtained by first considering a system of equations $\mathbf{s}_{ko}^T \mathbf{d} = c(\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon)$ for all MPCs k, o to then solve it for $\mathbf{d}$ with the Moore-Penrose inverse of $[\mathbf{s}_{1,1} \quad \mathbf{s}_{2,1} \dots]^T$. Vice versa, when $\mathbf{d}$ is known, then $\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}}$ is found by computing the mean of the values $\Delta_{ko} - \frac{1}{c} \mathbf{s}_{ko}^T \mathbf{d}$ over all k, o .

Under the employed assumptions, the estimation error $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}} - \mathbf{d} = (\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T)^{-1}\mathbf{E}(c\mathbf{n})$ applies, however we desire a more intuitive description of the estimation accuracy. In Appendix D-2 we show that the RMSE approximation

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}} - \mathbf{d}\|^2]} \approx \frac{3c\sigma}{\sqrt{K}} \quad (38)$$

is accurate for the special case $\mathbf{n} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_K)$ with the plane-wave assumption, large K , and random $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ with i.i.d. uniform distributions on the 3D unit sphere. In comparison to the RMSE of the MVUE distance estimator (26), the expression (38) shows no systematic increase with d . The decay with increasing K is rather slow. The same RMSE expression (38) applies in the synchronous case. Hence, there is no indication of improved accuracy from a preceding synchronization.

Finally, we point out a technically interesting adaptation. When only the MPC directions $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ but not $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ are available, then the plane-wave assumption (PWA) $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} \approx \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}_{ko} \approx \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ allows to still use the estimators (36) and (37) with hardly any accuracy loss for small d ; cf. (13) versus (14). We define an estimator which utilizes this technological advantage:

$$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta, \text{PWA}}^{\text{LSE}} := \hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}} \Big|_{\mathbf{s}_{ko} = \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}}. \quad (39)$$

B. Position Estimates Directly From Delays

Based on the property $\mathbf{d} = c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)} \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} - c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)} \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ from (12), we study an alternative scheme which directly uses the delays instead of their differences. We consider the estimation of $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ from measured delays $\tau_{ko}^{(A)}$ and $\tau_{ko}^{(B)}$ subject to clock offsets $\epsilon_o^{(A)}$ and $\epsilon_o^{(B)} = \epsilon_o^{(A)} - \epsilon$, respectively, and measurement errors $n_{ko}^{(A)}$ and $n_{ko}^{(B)}$. Again, the processing relies on accurate knowledge of the MPC directions $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ and $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$.

In Appendix D-3 we show that the joint LSE of $\mathbf{d}$ and all relevant clock offsets is given by

$$\left[(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\tau}^{\text{LSE}})^T, c\hat{\epsilon}, c\hat{\epsilon}_1^{(A)}, \dots, c\hat{\epsilon}_M^{(A)} \right]^T = (\mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{G})^{-1} \mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{t} \quad (40)$$

whereby $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{(3K) \times (4+M)}$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{(3K) \times 1}$ are defined as

$$\mathbf{G} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_3 & \mathbf{e}_{1,1}^{(B)} & \mathbf{e}_{1,1}^{(B)} - \mathbf{e}_{1,1}^{(A)} & & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & & \\ \mathbf{I}_3 & \mathbf{e}_{K_1,1}^{(B)} & \mathbf{e}_{K_1,1}^{(B)} - \mathbf{e}_{K_1,1}^{(A)} & & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \\ \mathbf{I}_3 & \mathbf{e}_{1,M}^{(B)} & & & \mathbf{e}_{1,M}^{(B)} - \mathbf{e}_{1,M}^{(A)} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & & \vdots & \\ \mathbf{I}_3 & \mathbf{e}_{K_M,M}^{(B)} & & & \mathbf{e}_{K_M,M}^{(B)} - \mathbf{e}_{K_M,M}^{(A)} & \end{bmatrix}, \quad (41)$$

$$\mathbf{t} = \begin{bmatrix} c\tau_{1,1}^{(B)} \mathbf{e}_{1,1}^{(B)} - c\tau_{1,1}^{(A)} \mathbf{e}_{1,1}^{(A)} \\ \vdots \\ c\tau_{K_M,M}^{(B)} \mathbf{e}_{K_M,M}^{(B)} - c\tau_{K_M,M}^{(A)} \mathbf{e}_{K_M,M}^{(A)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The MLE is omitted; it would require the joint PDF of $\mathbf{n}^{(A)}, \mathbf{n}^{(B)}$. When all clock offsets between the nodes and all observers are a-priori known, then the LSE reduces to

$$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by } \tau, \text{sync}}^{\text{LSE}} = \frac{c}{K} \sum_{o=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{K_o} (\tau_{ko}^{(B)} - \epsilon_o^{(B)}) \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} - (\tau_{ko}^{(A)} - \epsilon_o^{(A)}) \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}. \quad (42)$$

It is apparent that the estimators (40) and (42) rely on the MPC directions $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}, \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ being measured with high accuracy. Furthermore, the approach is fundamentally incompatible with the plane-wave assumption (14). This is due to the nature of the underlying property (12), best seen in Appendix A.

C. Establishing the MPC Association

The relative position estimators stated in Sec. IV-A and IV-B assumed knowledge of the MPC association and of the MPC directions $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ and $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$. The MPC directions are particularly useful for reconstructing the MPC association in case it is a-priori unknown, which is the topic of this subsection.

We assume that the MPC directions $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ and $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ are stated within the same frame of reference (this could be enforced by solving an orthogonal Procrustes problem). The MPC association relating to observer o is formalized in terms of a permutation $k' = \pi_o(k)$ with $k, k' \in \{1, \dots, K_o\}$. We propose the following geometry-inspired data-fitting rule to reconstruct the MPC association given the MPC directions and delays:

$$\hat{\pi}_o = \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi_{K_o}} J(k, \pi(k)), \quad (43)$$

$$J(k, l) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_o} \|\mathbf{e}_{l,o}^{(B)} - \mathbf{e}_{k,o}^{(A)}\|^2 + \lambda^2 |\tau_{l,o}^{(B)} - \mu_o^{(B)} - \tau_{k,o}^{(A)} - \mu_o^{(A)}|^2.$$

This search is done individually per observer $o \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. Afterwards, the association between MPCs $\bullet_{k,o}^{(A)}$ and $\bullet_{\hat{\pi}_o(k),o}^{(B)}$ allows to use any estimator from Sec. III-A, IV-A and IV-B.

The expression uses the averages $\mu_o^{(\bullet)} = \frac{1}{K_o} \sum_{k=1}^{K_o} \tau_{k,o}^{(\bullet)}$. These terms can be replaced by $\mu_o^{(\bullet)} = \epsilon^{(\bullet)}$ in the synchronous case. The regularization constant λ^2 balances cost contributions by MPC directions and delays. If λ is large then (43) tends to associate the MPCs in the order of their delay. A sensible choice is given by $\lambda = 1/\sigma_\tau$ where σ_τ is the channel delay spread (or a coarse estimate thereof).

If the MPC directions at the observer (denoted $\mathbf{f}_{ko}^{(\bullet)}$) are also known, then they can be included in the scheme by adding the summand $\|\mathbf{f}_{\pi(k),o}^{(B)} - \mathbf{f}_{ko}^{(A)}\|^2$ to (43). Likewise, $\mathbf{f}_{ko}^{(\bullet)}$ can replace $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(\bullet)}$ in (43) if the latter are unavailable (e.g., for distance estimation between low-complexity nodes A and B but with high-complexity observers with antenna arrays).

The optimization problem (43) is a linear assignment problem, which can be solved efficiently with the Hungarian method [43]. This avoids the tedious evaluation of all $K_o!$ possible permutations. The cost function $J(k, l)$ is related to the optimal subpattern assignment (OSPA) metric [43, Eq. (3)].

The framework of linear assignment problems can handle MPCs $\bullet_{ko}^{(A)}$ without a corresponding $\bullet_{ko}^{(B)}$. It is furthermore able to detect and reject bad associations: large angles between $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ and $\mathbf{e}_{l,o}^{(B)}$ indicate an incorrect association. We implement this notion by setting the cost $J(k, l) = \infty$ if the angle exceeds a threshold of 30° .

V. NUMERICAL ACCURACY EVALUATION

We evaluate the estimators' accuracy numerically via random sampling of MPC parameters. The statistical assumptions described in the following are characteristic of dense indoor multipath channels. Any observer is at a distance of 5 m from $\mathbf{p}^{(A)}$, giving a minimum delay of $\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)} \geq \tau_{\min} = 16.7$ ns. The excess delay is sampled according to the statistical channel model for indoor multipath propagation by Saleh and Valenzuela [44]. The mean interarrival times are set to 20 ns and 10 ns between and within clusters, respectively. The resulting power-delay profile has double-exponential shape and an RMS delay spread of $\sigma_\tau = 26.3$ ns, a mean excess delay of $\bar{\tau} = 40.5$ ns, and a mean delay of $\mathbb{E}[\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}] = \tau_{\min} + \bar{\tau} = 57.2$ ns. The K largest-power samples are then chosen. We expect problems with MPC association unless $d \ll c\sigma_\tau = 7.9$ m and, likewise, we expect the PWA (14) to be accurate for $d \ll c \cdot \mathbb{E}[\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}] = 17.2$ m. Additionally, the MPC directions $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ are independently drawn from a uniform distribution over the 3D unit sphere. We set $\mathbf{p}^{(B)} = \mathbf{p}^{(A)} + \mathbf{d}$ with $\mathbf{d} = [d, 0, 0]^T$. Then $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ is obtained by normalizing $\mathbf{d} + c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)} \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$. Delay measurement errors are sampled according to $n_{ko}^{(A)}, n_{ko}^{(B)} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{\sigma^2}{2})$, giving $n_{ko} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. Any MPC direction $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(\cdot)}$ used by a relative position estimator (i.e. a measured direction) is assumed to deviate from its true value by an angle $\alpha \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\text{dir}}^2)$; the unit vector $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(\cdot)}$ is then uniformly sampled from the circle defined by the value α .

We assume the values $d = 2$ m, $\sigma = 0.2$ ns, $\sigma_{\text{dir}} = 0$ unless either variable defines the abscissa of a graph. A legend of the evaluated estimators is given in Tables I and II.

The experiment in Fig. 5 studies the effect of varying d , σ , and σ_{dir} . It considers $K_o = 4$ MPCs for each of three observers $o \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, giving a total of $K = 12$ MPCs.

Fig. 5a shows that distance estimation suffers a significant accuracy loss when the MPC association is unknown (cases NA and SO). The simple SO scheme, which just applies $\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}}$ after associating the MPCs by sorting the delays in ascending order, surprisingly outperforms the sophisticated $\hat{d}_{\text{N/A}}^{\text{MLE}}$ (NA). One reason for that is the lack of bias-correction in $\hat{d}_{\text{N/A}}^{\text{MLE}}$, which could be addressed by future work. For the distance MVUE (known association, case MV), the RMSE evolution agrees well with analytical projections (26), (28).

In Fig. 5b, the position estimator $\mathbf{d}_{\text{by } \Delta}^{\text{LSE}}$ (case DD) demonstrates great accuracy. It is limited only by the small assumed delay error σ in this experiment; the DD-case RMSE value is near-constant at a very small value of about 61.8 mm (sync.: 57.3 mm). These agree well with the analytical projection $\frac{3c\sigma}{\sqrt{K}} = \frac{3 \cdot 0.3 \frac{\text{m}}{\text{ns}} \cdot 0.2 \text{ ns}}{\sqrt{12}} \approx 52$ mm from (38). The estimator $\mathbf{d}_{\text{by } \tau}^{\text{LSE}}$ (case TAU) achieves an even lower RMSE of 30.7 mm (sync.: 17.3 mm). We attribute this to the utilization of more information (both $\tau_{ko}^{(B)}$ and $\tau_{ko}^{(A)}$, not just $\tau_{ko}^{(B)} - \tau_{ko}^{(A)}$). Even with the PWA or with a reconstructed MPC association (scheme from Sec. IV-C, cases DDN and TNA) the accuracy is great up to distances close to the observer distance (here 5 m).

Fig. 5c and 5d show the RMSE versus the measurement error level. All cases show an intuitive increase with σ . For small σ , the distance estimators' RMSE are still dominated by the unknown (and randomly modeled) MPC directions.




Fig. 5. Numerical evaluation of the estimation RMSE versus different parameters. The experiment assumes $M = 3$ observers, number of MPCs $K_1 = K_2 = K_3 = 4 \Rightarrow K = 12$, distance $d = 2$ m, $\sigma = 0.2$ ns. The light-colored (cyan) graphs relate to cases with precise time-synchronization.




Fig. 6. Numerical evaluation of the estimation RMSE versus the number of MPCs K for $M = 1$ observers, $d = 2$ m, $\sigma = 0.2$ ns. The light-colored graphs relate to cases with precise a-priori time synchronization.

Fig. 5e shows a very important difference between the two different approaches for position estimation. In particular, the Δ -based position LSE (cases DD, PWA, DDN) copes with erroneous MPC direction measurements very well. The τ -based position LSE (cases TAU, TNA) however deteriorates even for small directional errors. This is caused by the omnipresence of terms $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} - \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ in the matrix $\mathbf{G}$ when computing $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\tau}^{\text{LSE}}$ in (41). In simpler terms, it is clear that the underlying property $\mathbf{d} = c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} - c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ from (12) can only allow for accurate estimates $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ with accurate knowledge of $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ and $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$.

black | No synchronization assumption other than (17)
cyan | Also assumes precise a-priori time sync. between A, B

TABLE I
LEGEND OF COLOR CODES FOR SIMULATION RESULTS.

abbreviations for distance estimators		
∇	MV	$\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}}$ from (23)
$\triangle$	ML	$\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}}$ from (19)
$\bullet$	NA	$\hat{d}_{\text{N/A}}^{\text{MLE}}$ from (29) (unknown MPC assoc.)
$*$	SO	$\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}}$ from (23), assoc. estimated via τ -sorting
abbreviations for position estimators		
$\square$	DD	$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}}$ from (37)
$\circ$	PWA	$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta, \text{PWA}}^{\text{LSE}}$ from (39) (plane-wave assumption)
$+$	DDN	$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}}$ from (37), assoc. estimated via Sec. IV-C
$\diamond$	TAU	$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\tau}^{\text{LSE}}$ from (40)
$\times$	TNA	$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\tau}^{\text{LSE}}$ from (40), assoc. estimated via Sec. IV-C

TABLE II
LEGEND OF ESTIMATORS FOR SIMULATION RESULTS.

The complimentary experiment in Fig. 6 studies the effect of the number of MPCs K on the estimation accuracy. It considers only one observer ($M = 1$). Clearly, all estimators benefit from an increasing K . For $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}}$ (DD, PWA) it seems particularly fruitful to exceed the minimum K of 4 by some margin, to ensure that $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T$ in (37) is well-conditioned.

VI. PRACTICAL FEASIBILITY STUDY

We shall now test the proposed paradigm in practice, using UWB channel measurements obtained in a large empty room (Fig. 7a) with an approximate size of $20 \text{ m} \times 10 \text{ m} \times 3 \text{ m}$. The floor plan is shown in Fig. 7c. Our experiment uses a single observer node ($M = 1$); the index $o = 1$ is discarded. This observer node is static at the position $[8.5 \text{ m}, 5 \text{ m}, 1 \text{ m}]^T$.

Node A is static at position $\mathbf{p}^{(A)} = [15.5 \text{ m}, 3 \text{ m}, 1 \text{ m}]^T$. This is also the starting point of a half-circle trajectory on which the mobile node B is sequentially placed on (see Fig. 7d). The half-circle radius is 0.5 m and the center $[15.5 \text{ m}, 2.5 \text{ m}, 1 \text{ m}]^T$. The different positions $\mathbf{p}^{(B)}$ are referred to by a trajectory position index $1, \dots, 36$ with increasing distance to $\mathbf{p}^{(A)}$ (index 0). We chose such a curved trajectory to ensure versatility of $\mathbf{d}$ compared to the MPC directions $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$.

Each CIR measurement between the observer node and another node (A or B) was obtained as follows. With a vector network analyzer (VNA), we recorded the frequency response over the range $5 - 10 \text{ GHz}$, with a spacing of $\Delta f = 3.125 \text{ MHz}$. The data was transformed into the delay domain using an inverse Fourier transform with offline processing in Matlab. The results over the course of the trajectory are shown in Fig. 7e, in a $20 - 65 \text{ ns}$ time window which contains all major MPCs. Several distinct MPCs are clearly visible. Fig. 7f shows two exemplary CIRs (position index 0 and 18) in detail.

As the propagation environment is time-invariant, we do not have to acquire the CIRs $h^{(A)}(\tau)$ and $h^{(B)}(\tau)$ simultaneously. Instead we measure the CIRs sequentially over the trajectory




Fig. 7. Experiment environment, measurement equipment, and obtained channel measurements.

positions $0, \dots, 36$ and declare the index-0 CIR measurement as $h^{(A)}(\tau)$. The indices $1, \dots, 36$ yield the set of CIRs $h^{(B)}(\tau)$.

After applying a standard peak-extraction algorithm to the CIRs (Matlab function `findpeaks`), we handpicked a suitable selection of MPCs (see the colored graphs in Fig. 7e). Thereby we omitted MPCs that do not occur distinctly over the entire trajectory. It is important to note that the chosen MPCs are not always the five largest-amplitude MPCs in every single CIR, mainly due to small-scale fading. This highlights the importance of appropriate MPC tracking and selection schemes for real-time systems, where careful offline processing would not be an option.

In Fig. 8 we evaluate various proposed estimators for each $\mathbf{p}^{(B)}$ on the trajectory and the associated measured CIR. In particular we evaluate the distance estimators $\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}}$ and $\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}}_{\text{sync}}$ from (23) and (25). We furthermore evaluate the relative position estimator $\hat{\mathbf{d}}^{\text{LSE}}_{\text{by } \Delta, \text{PWA}}$ from (39), which uses




Fig. 8. Estimation accuracy resulting from measured delays. The light-colored (cyan) graphs relate to cases with precise time-synchronization.

a plane-wave approximation for the proximity of $\mathbf{p}^{(A)}$, in its synchronous and asynchronous version. The MPC directions $\mathbf{e}_k^{(A)}$ were estimated with a least-squares approach applied to the set of measured MPC delays over the entire trajectory.

The estimators perform very well and exhibit impressively small distance errors, especially in the beginning of the trajectory (i.e. for very small distances). The evaluated estimators show very good distance accuracy, even for the farthest positions of node B. The estimated trajectory in Fig. 8b also exhibits great accuracy. Thus, we can conclude that the proposed approaches are practically feasible, even without precise time-synchronization.

VII. TECHNOLOGICAL COMPARISON AND OPPORTUNITIES

We shall discuss the proposal's advantages, disadvantages, novel opportunities, and accuracy compared to the state of the art in wireless ranging and localization. We note that the conceptual and technological uniqueness of the proposed paradigm prevents a direct quantitative comparison.

A. Requirements

A crucial requirement for the presented estimators is rich multipath propagation with distinct MPCs from diverse directions (a noteworthy exception is $\hat{\mathbf{d}}^{\text{LSE}}_{\text{by } \tau, \text{sync}}$). In order to resolve MPCs in the measured CIRs, a large signal bandwidth is required. The approximate minimum bandwidth is 500 MHz for indoor environments [30]. These requirements constitute a disadvantage compared to classical RSS- or TOA-based schemes, which perform best in free space. Furthermore, an RSS scheme can operate with arbitrarily small bandwidth.

The requirements could be alleviated if future work succeeds in formulating advanced estimators which process the CIRs directly, without relying on extracted MPCs.

B. Advantages

The key advantages of the paradigm are revealed by the following observation. Certain technical quantities and conditions usually play a crucial role in localization algorithms but simply do not occur in our estimator formulations. In particular, *major advantages* arise from the following *absent requirements*:

- 1) No line-of-sight conditions required, neither from A to B, from observers to A or B, nor between observers.

- 2) No time-invariant propagation environment required.
- 3) No knowledge of the environment required.
- 4) No knowledge of the observer positions required.
- 5) No interaction between A and B required.

A subset of the estimators exhibits the following advantages:

- 6) No precise synchronization required between A and B, between observers, or between an observer and A or B.
- 7) No knowledge of the MPC association required.
- 8) No knowledge of the MPC directions required.

C. Opportunities and Use Cases

The advantage 1 makes the proposed paradigm *suitable for dense and crowded environments*, where LOS obstruction is typical and where most localization schemes struggle [5]. The advantages 2, 3, 4 make the paradigm *qualified for dynamic settings* with time-variant channels. In such circumstances, any scheme that crucially relies on training or calibration would deteriorate heavily (e.g., fingerprinting [21], [22] or parameter estimation with calibrated channel models [4], [15]).

One intriguing use case enabled by the proposed paradigm is *interaction-free distance estimation between mobile users* purely by evaluating their channels *at the infrastructure* end (base stations or WiFi routers). The resulting surveillance potential could prompt ethical questions. Candidate wideband technologies are 802.11ad and 5G NR FR2, where the CIRs could be computed from OFDM channel state information with an inverse Fourier transform. This use case can provide distance estimates for *cooperative localization*, e.g. for the schemes in [25], without interaction between the mobiles.

Another interesting use case is *proximity testing* of a mobile (node B) to some *point of interest* (node A), e.g., an access gate. The CIR $h^{(A)}$ could be a pre-recorded fingerprint or updated periodically. Such live updates qualify the approach for time-varying channels and can be realized by periodically transmitting training sequences at a beacon (node A). Since nothing else is required from node A (cf. advantages 5 and 6), the beacon can be ultra-low complexity.

Magnificently, *mobiles can act as observers* due to advantage 4. Thus, pairwise estimates can be obtained without any infrastructure, e.g. for *ad-hoc network localization*. Thereby, N mobiles yield $M = N - 2$ observers and thus large K for each pairwise estimate, which promises great accuracy.

D. Comparison to RSS and TOA Ranging Accuracy

First, we address the question of whether the novel $\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}}$ from (23) can beat the accuracy of RSS-based distance estimation between A and B. We conduct a comparison based on analytical RMSE expressions: on the one hand $d \cdot (\frac{2}{(K+1)(K+2)})^{1/2}$ from (26) and on the other hand the Cramér-Rao lower bound (CRLB) $\frac{\log(10)}{10\alpha} \sigma_{\text{sh}} d$ on the RSS-based distance RMSE [16]. This CRLB assumes a log-normal shadowing model with standard deviation σ_{sh} in dB and path-loss exponent α . We find that the asynchronous $\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}}$ has lower RMSE than the RSS scheme if $K \geq \lceil \sqrt{x^2 + \frac{1}{4}} - \frac{3}{2} \rceil$ with $x = \frac{10\sqrt{2}}{\log(10)} \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_{\text{sh}}}$. This threshold is plotted in Fig. 9 as a function of σ_{sh} and typical values of α . We conclude that the proposed $\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}}$




Fig. 9. Minimum number of MPCs K such that the proposed delay-difference-based distance MVUE (23) has lower RMSE than RSS-based distance estimation between A and B in log-normal shadowing.

with large K (e.g., by using many observers) outperforms an RSS scheme in dense propagation environments (large σ_{sh}).

Likewise, we want to compare the proposed $\hat{d}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}}$ to TOA distance estimation. We recall the position RMSE approximation $3c\sigma/\sqrt{K}$ from (38), which assumes that the delay-measurement accuracy is the dominant source of error. For TOA in LOS conditions (AWGN channel), the CRLB on the distance RMSE is given by $c\sigma_{\text{TOA}}$ with $\sigma_{\text{TOA}} = (\pi B\sqrt{8 \cdot \text{SNR}})^{-1}$ and effective bandwidth B [16]. We make the reasonable assumption $\sigma = \sigma_{\text{TOA}}\sqrt{2}$ and obtain the following criterion. If $K > 18$, then the position RMSE of $\hat{d}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}}$ actually beats the distance RMSE of LOS-case TOA. In fact, the accuracy witnessed in Sec. V and VI compares very well to reports of practical TOA accuracy [18], [33], [45].

VIII. SUMMARY & OUTLOOK

For wireless UWB systems we proposed a novel paradigm for pairwise distance estimation or relative position estimation, which opens up exciting novel technological opportunities. We derived various estimators and studied their accuracy in theory and practice. Open topics for future research are the detailed embedding of the estimators in localization algorithms (e.g. for cooperative network localization), the use of temporal filtering and improved MPC association schemes (e.g., with belief propagation and possibly incorporating the RSS between A and B), extensive field trials (e.g., with mmWave massive-MIMO systems), the merits of machine learning to this paradigm, analytic results on the error due to inaccurate MPC directions, and MPC selection schemes in the light of path overlap and selective MPC shadowing.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF PROPAGATION-GEOMETRIC PROPERTIES

This appendix derives the geometric properties (11) to (13) which hold for each MPC k, o . Without loss of generality we assume that the observer is transmitting. We consider a specific MPC k, o in terms of its virtual source [5], [27], [46]. The virtual source position is denoted $\mathbf{p}_{k,o} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. The model is shown in Fig. 10. It is an equivalent description of the MPC delays $\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}, \bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)}$ and directions of arrival $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}, \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$.

The delay-difference bounds $-d \leq c\bar{\Delta}_{ko} \leq d$ in (11) are obtained by applying the triangle inequality to Fig. 10a:

$$c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)} \leq c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)} + d \implies c(\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)} - \bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}) \geq -d, \quad (44)$$

$$c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)} \leq c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)} + d \implies c(\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)} - \bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}) \leq d. \quad (45)$$

The vector equality $\mathbf{d} = c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} - c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ in (12) follows from $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{p}^{(B)} - \mathbf{p}^{(A)}$ together with $\mathbf{p}^{(B)} = \mathbf{p}_{k,o} + c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ and $\mathbf{p}^{(A)} = \mathbf{p}_{k,o} + c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$, which are deduced from Fig. 10b.




Fig. 10. Triangle formed by the positions of node A, node B, and the virtual source representation of the k -th MPC associated with observer o .

To prove the projection equality (13) we consider the above vector equality. On both sides we form the inner product with $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ to obtain $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} = c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)}a - c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}$ with $a := (\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)})^T \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$. Likewise, $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} = c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)} - c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}a$. The sum of the equations is $\mathbf{d}^T (\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} + \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}) = c(\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)} - \bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)})(1 + a) = c\bar{\Delta}_{ko}(1 + a)$. $\square$

APPENDIX B

DERIVATION OF DISTANCE ESTIMATORS FOR KNOWN MPC ASSOCIATION

1) *General Case MLE*: We derive the distance MLE rule (19). We recall that the true delay differences have uniform distribution $\bar{\Delta}_{ko} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{U}(-d/c, d/c)$ under the employed assumptions. Thus the PDF $f_{\bar{\Delta}_{ko}|d}(\bar{\Delta}_{ko}|d) = \frac{c}{2d} \mathbb{1}_{[-d/c, d/c]}(\bar{\Delta}_{ko})$. We consider $\Delta_{ko} = \bar{\Delta}_{ko} + n_{ko} + \epsilon$ where ϵ is non-random and $\bar{\Delta}_{ko}, n_{ko}$ are statistically independent. The PDF of Δ_{ko} is thus given by the convolution of PDFs

$$f(\Delta_{ko} | d, \epsilon) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_{n_{ko}}(z) f_{\bar{\Delta}_{ko}|d}(\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon - z | d) dz \quad (46)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_{n_{ko}}(z) \frac{c}{2d} \mathbb{1}_{[-d/c, d/c]}(\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon - z) dz \quad (47)$$

$$= \frac{c}{2d} \int_{\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon - d/c}^{\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon + d/c} f_{n_{ko}}(z) dz = \frac{c}{2d} I_{ko}(\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon, d). \quad (48)$$

This coincides with the definition of I_{ko} in (20). The Δ_{ko} are statistically independent for different k, o and their joint PDF is thus the product of PDFs (48). We replace the true values d, ϵ with free variables $\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}$ to express the likelihood function

$$L(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}) = f(\Delta_{1,1}, \Delta_{2,1}, \dots, \Delta_{K,M} | d = \tilde{d}, \epsilon = \tilde{\epsilon}) \quad (49)$$

$$= \left(\frac{c}{2}\right)^K \tilde{d}^{-K} \prod_{o=1}^M \prod_{k=1}^{K_o} I_{ko}(\Delta_{ko} - \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{d}). \quad (50)$$

Any value pair $(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon})$ that maximizes $L(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon})$ is an MLE. We discard the constant prefactor $(\frac{c}{2})^K$ and obtain (19).

2) *No-Measurement-Error Case MLE*: Here $n_{ko} \equiv 0 \Rightarrow f_{n_{ko}}(x) = \delta(x)$ and thus the soft indicator function in (48) becomes the actual indicator function $I_{ko}(\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon, d) = \mathbb{1}_{[-d/c, d/c]}(\Delta_{ko} - \epsilon)$. We use it in (50) and note that the likelihood scales like $L \propto \tilde{d}^{-K}$ on the LHF support $\text{supp}(L)$. The MLE is thus given by the pair $(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}) \in \text{supp}(L)$ with

minimum $\tilde{d}$. We note that $(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}) \in \text{supp}(L)$ iff $\tilde{\epsilon} - \tilde{d}/c \leq \Delta_{ko} \leq \tilde{\epsilon} + \tilde{d}/c \forall k, o$ and find the MLE by requiring $\tilde{\epsilon} + \tilde{d}/c = \max_{k,o} \Delta_{ko}$ as well as $\tilde{\epsilon} - \tilde{d}/c = \min_{k,o} \Delta_{ko}$. The sum of those equations yields the $\hat{\epsilon}^{\text{MLE}}$ formula in (24), the difference yields $\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}}$ in (21).

3) *MLE Bias and MVUE Property*: We use an index $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ for the MPCs across all observers. The uniform distribution $\Delta_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{U}(-\frac{d}{c} + \epsilon, \frac{d}{c} + \epsilon)$ follows from the assumptions in Sec. III with $n_i \equiv 0$. The problem of estimating d, ϵ (or just d given ϵ) from all Δ_i is equivalent to the problem of estimating the parameters of a uniform distribution from iid samples. Hence, the MLE results (21),(22),(24) and MVUE results (23),(24),(25) follow directly from respective statements in the mathematical literature, e.g. [47, Cpt. 8].

Since these estimators are central to the paper, we provide more detail. Let $x_i := \frac{c|\Delta_i - \epsilon|}{d}$ and $y_i := \frac{c(\Delta_i - \epsilon)}{2d} + \frac{1}{2}$; they fulfill $x_i \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$, $y_i \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$. With their order statistics $x_{(i)}, y_{(i)}$ we can express $\hat{d}_{\text{sync}}^{\text{MLE}} = x_{(K)} \cdot d$ and $\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}} = (y_{(K)} - y_{(1)}) \cdot d$. From [48, Eq. (1.146)] we find that $x_{(i)}, y_{(i)} \sim \text{Beta}(i, K - i + 1)$ with $\mathbb{E}[x_{(i)}] = \mathbb{E}[y_{(i)}] = \frac{i}{K+1}$. We obtain $\mathbb{E}[\hat{d}_{\text{sync}}^{\text{MLE}}] = \frac{K}{K+1}d$ and $\mathbb{E}[\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}}] = \frac{K-1}{K+1}d$, i.e. the estimators are biased, however $\hat{d}_{\text{sync}}^{\text{MVUE}} = \frac{K+1}{K}\hat{d}_{\text{sync}}^{\text{MLE}}$ and $\hat{d}^{\text{MVUE}} = \frac{K+1}{K-1}\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}}$ are unbiased. Their minimum-variance property is due to the Lehmann-Scheffé theorem [49] as the determining $x_{(K)}$ and $y_{(K)}, y_{(1)}$ are complete sufficient statistics of the respective uniform distribution parameters.

APPENDIX C

PROOF: DISTANCE MLE, UNKNOWN MPC ASSOCIATION

1) *Derivation of MLE rule (29) for $M = 1$* : We consider only one specific observer o and discard the index o . We recall $\tau_k^{(B)} = \tau_k^{(A)} + \Delta_k$ from (18), $\Delta_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{U}(-d/c + \epsilon, d/c + \epsilon)$ from Sec. III, and $f(\tau_k^{(B)} | \tau_k^{(A)}, d, \epsilon) = \frac{c}{2d} I_k(\tau_k^{(B)} - \tau_k^{(A)} - \epsilon, d)$ with $I_k(x, d) = F_{n_k}(x + d/c) - F_{n_k}(x - d/c)$ from (20) and (48). We introduce the shorthand notation $f(\tau_k^{(B)} | \tau_k^{(A)}, d, \epsilon) = g_k(\tau_k^{(B)})$ with $g_k(\bullet) := \frac{c}{2d} I_k(\bullet - \tau_k^{(A)} - \epsilon, d)$.

The observed delays $\tau_k^{(A)}$ are considered as non-random parameters. Without loss of generality we assume that the MPC indexation is such that $\tau_1^{(A)} \leq \dots \leq \tau_K^{(A)}$. The corresponding delays $\tau_k^{(B)}$ may or may not have the same order; this circumstance is unknown and unobserved. Given the non-random parameters, the random variables $\tau_1^{(B)} \dots \tau_K^{(B)}$ are statistically independent but have non-identical distributions (PDFs g_k). As random observations we consider the order statistics $\tau_{(k)}^{(B)}$ which are observable and fulfill $\tau_{(1)}^{(B)} \leq \dots \leq \tau_{(K)}^{(B)}$ by definition. According to [50, Eq. (6)], the joint PDF of the order statistics $\tau_{(k)}^{(B)}$ is given by the permanent of a $K \times K$ matrix $(\mathbf{A})_{k,l} = g_k(\tau_{(l)}^{(B)})$. By a property of matrix permanents [50] we obtain a sum over all length- K permutations $\pi(\bullet)$,

$$f(\tau_{(1)}^{(B)}, \dots, \tau_{(K)}^{(B)} | \tau_1^{(A)}, \dots, \tau_K^{(A)}, d, \epsilon) = \text{perm}(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_K} \prod_{k=1}^K g_k(\tau_{(\pi(k))}^{(B)}). \quad (51)$$

This sum does not depend on the actual order or the observed order of $\tau_1^{(B)}, \dots, \tau_K^{(B)}$. Thus $\tau_{(\pi(k))}^{(B)}$ can be replaced by $\tau_{\pi(k)}^{(B)}$.

By fixing all τ -values in (51) upon observation and replacing the true values d, ϵ with variables $\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}$ we obtain the LHF

$$L(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}) = \left(\frac{c}{2\tilde{d}}\right)^K \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_K} \prod_{k=1}^K I_k(\tau_{\pi(k)}^{(B)} - \tau_k^{(A)} - \tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{d}). \quad (52)$$

Furthermore discarding the constant factor $(\frac{c}{2})^K$ yields the MLE rule (29) for the case $M = 1$. $\square$

Finally, we note that the resulting $\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}}$ is symmetric and $\hat{\epsilon}^{\text{MLE}}$ is antisymmetric in the arguments $\tau_k^{(B)}, \tau_k^{(A)}$ (if f_{n_k} is symmetric). This is a desirable property because the A/B labeling is arbitrary. It justifies our seemingly arbitrary choice of considering only the distribution of $\tau_k^{(B)}$ but not of $\tau_k^{(A)}$.

2) *Extension to multiple observers*: The LHF is now the product $L(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}) = \prod_{o=1}^M L_o(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon})$ of terms (52) written as L_o . This is due to the statistical independence of the order statistics $\tau_{(1),o}^{(B)}, \dots, \tau_{(K_o),o}^{(B)}$ between different observers o , as a result of the known MPC-observer association (as argued in Sec. II). $\square$

3) *MLE candidates for the case $n_{ko} \equiv 0$* : We consider only one specific observer o and discard the index. Analogous to Appendix B-2, $n_k \equiv 0$ transforms the LHF from (29) into $(\frac{c}{2\tilde{d}})^K \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_K} \prod_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}_{[-\tilde{d}/c, \tilde{d}/c]}(\tau_{\pi(k)}^{(B)} - \tau_k^{(A)} - \tilde{\epsilon})$. This LHF is a superposition of wedges (see Fig. 3c), each determined by the inequalities $\epsilon \leq d/c + S_\pi$ and $\epsilon \geq -d/c + L_\pi$ with $L_\pi = \max_k \tau_{\pi(k)}^{(B)} - \tau_k^{(A)}$ and $S_\pi = \min_k \tau_{\pi(k)}^{(B)} - \tau_k^{(A)}$. The points of interest for evaluation are then the peaks of the wedges, located at $(\frac{c}{2}(L_\pi - S_\pi), \frac{1}{2}(L_\pi + S_\pi))$, and intersections between the wedges-borders located either at $(\frac{c}{2}(L_{\pi_1} - S_{\pi_2}), \frac{1}{2}(L_{\pi_1} + S_{\pi_2}))$ or at $(\frac{1}{2}(L_{\pi_2} - S_{\pi_1}), \frac{1}{2}(L_{\pi_2} + S_{\pi_1}))$ if they exist. Thus we can write all candidate points as $(\tilde{d}, \tilde{\epsilon}) = (\frac{c}{2}(L - S), \frac{1}{2}(L + S))$ with $(L, S) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \bigcup_{\pi \in \Pi_K} \max_k \tau_{\pi(k)}^{(B)} - \tau_k^{(A)}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ equivalently. The proof generalize to the multi-observer case by forming the union of candidate points of each observer.

APPENDIX D

DERIVATION OF RELATIVE POSITION ESTIMATORS

1) *General MLE from Δ_{ko}* : Using standard tools from estimation theory [42] we derive the joint MLE $(\hat{\mathbf{d}}^{\text{MLE}}, \hat{\epsilon}^{\text{MLE}})$ in (36), based on observed delay differences $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^K$ with $\Delta = \tilde{\Delta} + \mathbf{1}\epsilon + \mathbf{n} = \frac{1}{c}\mathbf{E}^T\boldsymbol{\theta} + \mathbf{n}$ cf. (18) and (32) to (35). Here $\boldsymbol{\theta} := [\mathbf{d}^T, c\epsilon]^T \in \mathbb{R}^4$ is the estimation parameter. The only randomness is constituted by the error vector with PDF $f_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{n})$. Now $\mathbf{n} = \Delta - \frac{1}{c}\mathbf{E}^T\boldsymbol{\theta}$ implies $f(\Delta|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{\mathbf{n}}(\Delta - \frac{1}{c}\mathbf{E}^T\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Fixing the observed Δ and replacing the true value $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ with a free variable $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ yields the likelihood function $L(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = f_{\mathbf{n}}(\Delta - \frac{1}{c}\mathbf{E}^T\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$. Any $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \arg \max L(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ is an MLE. $\square$

2) *Approximate RMSE of LSE from Δ_{ko}* : $(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T)^{-1}\mathbf{E}(c\Delta)$ from (37) exhibits a random estimation error $(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T)^{-1}\mathbf{E}(c\mathbf{n})$ for $K \geq 4$ under the employed assumptions ($\mathbf{n}$ is random, $\mathbf{E}$ is not). The estimation error has the covariance matrix $\mathbf{C} = c^2(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T)^{-1}\mathbf{E}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{n}\mathbf{n}^T]\mathbf{E}^T(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T)^{-1}$. The assumption $\mathbf{n} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_K)$ gives $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{n}\mathbf{n}^T] = \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_K$ and we obtain $\mathbf{C} = (c\sigma)^2(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T)^{-1}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T)^{-1} = (c\sigma)^2(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T)^{-1}$. We use the plane-wave assumption $\mathbf{s}_{ko} \approx \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$. For $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ with i.i.d. uniform distributions on the 3D unit sphere, $\frac{1}{K}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}$ converges to $\text{diag}(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, 1)$ for $K \rightarrow \infty$ [40, Lemma 4.3]. Thus $\mathbf{C} \approx \frac{(c\sigma)^2}{K} \text{diag}(3, 3, 3, 1)$ with $\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}} - \epsilon|^2] = C_{4,4} \approx \frac{\sigma^2}{K}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{LSE}} - \mathbf{d}\|^2] = \sum_{i=1}^3 C_{i,i} \approx \frac{(3c\sigma)^2}{K}$. $\square$

3) *LSE from $\tau_{ko}^{(A)}, \tau_{ko}^{(B)}$* : We recall $\mathbf{d} = c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(B)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} - c\bar{\tau}_{ko}^{(A)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ from (12) and reformulate to $\mathbf{d} = c(\tau_{ko}^{(B)} - \epsilon_o^{(A)} - \epsilon - n_{ko}^{(B)})\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} - c(\tau_{ko}^{(A)} - \epsilon_o^{(A)} - n_{ko}^{(B)})\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}$ with (15) to (17). We express this as a linear equation in terms of the unknown parameters, $[\mathbf{I}_3, \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}, \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} - \mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)}]^T \cdot [\mathbf{d}^T, c\epsilon, c\epsilon_o^{(A)}]^T = c\tau_{ko}^{(B)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)} - c\tau_{ko}^{(A)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} + cn_{ko}^{(A)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(A)} - cn_{ko}^{(B)}\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$. In the least-squares sense we discard the random error terms (the two rightmost summands) and require that the equation holds for all MPCs k, o . We obtain $\mathbf{G} \cdot [\mathbf{d}^T, c\epsilon, c\epsilon_1^{(A)}, \dots, c\epsilon_M^{(A)}]^T = \mathbf{t}$ with $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{t}$ from (41). The least-squares solution of this system is obtained with the Moore-Penrose inverse $(\mathbf{G}^T\mathbf{G})^{-1}\mathbf{G}^T$. $\square$

APPENDIX E

ESTIMATORS FOR THE FULLY ASYNCHRONOUS CASE

This appendix states the estimators adapted to the case that assumption (17) does not hold, e.g., when clock drift is significant over the duration of acquiring different CIR measurements. Then the inter-node clock offset ϵ is replaced by individual offsets ϵ_o for the different observers $o = 1, \dots, M$.

The distance MLE for unknown MPC directions, previously the two-dimensional problem (19), is now given by $(\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}}, \hat{\epsilon}^{\text{MLE}}) = \arg \max \frac{1}{d^K} \prod_{o=1}^M \prod_{k=1}^{K_o} I_{k,o}(\Delta_{k,o} - \tilde{\epsilon}_o, \tilde{d})$, $\tilde{d} \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^M$. For the zero-measurement-error case, cf. (21), $\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}} = \frac{c}{2} \cdot \max_o (\max_k \Delta_{k,o} - \min_k \Delta_{k,o})$ applies. Now any clock offset in the interval $\hat{\epsilon}_o^{\text{MLE}} \in [-\frac{1}{c}\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}} + \max_k \Delta_{k,o}, \frac{1}{c}\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}} + \min_k \Delta_{k,o}]$ has maximum likelihood; the interval midpoint is $\frac{1}{2}(\max_k \Delta_{k,o} + \min_k \Delta_{k,o})$. The o with the largest spread $\max_k \Delta_{k,o} - \min_k \Delta_{k,o}$ determines $\hat{d}^{\text{MLE}}$ and its $\hat{\epsilon}_o^{\text{MLE}}$ interval reduces to the stated midpoint value.

Now $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{MLE}}$, previously the four-dimensional problem (36), becomes a $(3 + M)$ -dimensional problem: $(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{MLE}}, \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{by}\Delta}^{\text{MLE}}) \in \arg \max f_{\mathbf{n}}(\Delta - \frac{1}{c}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}^T[\tilde{\mathbf{d}}^T, c\tilde{\epsilon}^T]^T)$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{d}} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Here $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}^T = [[\mathbf{s}_{1,1} \dots \mathbf{s}_{K_M,M}]^T, \mathbf{O}] \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times (3+M)}$ and $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times M}$ is a block-diagonal matrix of the all-ones vector blocks $\mathbf{1}_{K_1 \times 1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{K_M \times 1}$. The Gaussian-error-case MLE is $(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}^T)^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\Sigma^{-1}(c\Delta - c\boldsymbol{\mu})$ and the LSE $(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}^T)^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}(c\Delta)$, analogous to (37).

To adapt $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{by}\tau}^{\text{LSE}}$ in (40) and (41), expand $\mathbf{G}$ from size $(3K) \times (4 + M)$ to $(3K) \times (3 + 2M)$ by separating the entries $\mathbf{e}_{ko}^{(B)}$ of the fourth column into M separate columns for $o = 1, \dots, M$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank Florian Trösch of Schindler Aufzüge AG for contributing innovative ideas, Malte Göller for helping during initial investigations, Ninad Chitnis for helping with the measurement acquisition and processing, and Erik Leitinger for valuable discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Dumphart, M. Kuhn, A. Wittneben, and F. Trösch, "Inter-node distance estimation from multipath delay differences of channels to observer nodes," in *IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, 2019.
- [2] G. Dumphart, R. Kramer, and A. Wittneben, "Pairwise distance and position estimators from differences in UWB channels to observers," in *IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM) Workshops*, 2021, submitted.

- [3] M. Contigiani, R. Pietrini, A. Mancini, and P. Zingaretti, "Implementation of a tracking system based on UWB technology in a retail environment," in *IEEE/ASME International Conference on Mechatronic and Embedded Systems and Applications*, 2016.
- [4] R. Heyn, M. Kuhn, H. Schulten, G. Dumphart, J. Zwysig, F. Trösch, and A. Wittneben, "User tracking for access control with bluetooth low energy," in *IEEE Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC Spring)*, 2019.
- [5] K. Witrals, P. Meissner, E. Leitinger, Y. Shen, C. Gustafson, F. Tufvesson, K. Haneda, D. Dardari, A. F. Molisch, A. Conti *et al.*, "High-accuracy localization for assisted living: 5G systems will turn multipath channels from foe to friend," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 59–70, 2016.
- [6] S. Bartoletti, A. Conti, and M. Z. Win, "Device-free counting via wideband signals," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 1163–1174, 2017.
- [7] M. O. Gani, G. M. T. Ahsan, D. Do, W. Drew, M. Balfas, S. I. Ahmed, M. Arif, and A. J. Kattan, "An approach to localization in crowded area," in *IEEE International Conference on e-Health Networking, Applications and Services (Healthcom)*, 2016.
- [8] A. Ali, N. Gonzalez-Prelcic, R. W. Heath, and A. Ghosh, "Leveraging sensing at the infrastructure for mmWave communication," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 84–89, 2020.
- [9] A. Ranganathan and S. Capkun, "Are we really close? Verifying proximity in wireless systems," *IEEE Security & Privacy*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 52–58, 2017.
- [10] T. Altuwayan, M. Hadian, and X. Liang, "EPIC: efficient privacy-preserving contact tracing for infection detection," in *IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, 2018.
- [11] D. J. Leith and S. Farrell, "Coronavirus contact tracing: Evaluating the potential of using bluetooth received signal strength for proximity detection," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 66–74, 2020.
- [12] G. F. Hatke, M. Montanari, S. Appadwedula, M. Wentz, J. Meklenburg, L. Ivers, J. Watson, and P. Fiore, "Using Bluetooth Low Energy (BLE) signal strength estimation to facilitate contact tracing for COVID-19," MIT Lincoln Laboratory, Tech. Rep., 2020.
- [13] M. Cunche, A. Boutet, C. Castelluccia, C. Lauradoux, D. Le Métayer, and V. Roca, "On using Bluetooth-Low-Energy for contact tracing," Inria Grenoble Rhône-Alpes; INSA de Lyon, Tech. Rep., 2020.
- [14] A. Venus, E. Leitinger, S. Tertinek, and K. Witrals, "A message passing based adaptive PDA algorithm for robust radio-based localization and tracking," in *IEEE Radar Conference*. IEEE, 2021.
- [15] H. Schulten, M. Kuhn, R. Heyn, G. Dumphart, A. Wittneben, and F. Trösch, "On the crucial impact of antennas and diversity on BLE RSSI-based indoor localization," in *IEEE Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC Spring)*, 2019.
- [16] S. Gezici, Z. Tian, G. B. Giannakis, H. Kobayashi, A. F. Molisch, H. V. Poor, and Z. Sahinoglu, "Localization via ultra-wideband radios: a look at positioning aspects for future sensor networks," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 70–84, 2005.
- [17] D. Dardari, A. Conti, U. Ferner, A. Giorgetti, and M. Z. Win, "Ranging with ultrawide bandwidth signals in multipath environments," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 97, no. 2, pp. 404–426, 2009.
- [18] B. Alavi and K. Pahlavan, "Modeling of the TOA-based distance measurement error using UWB indoor radio measurements," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 275–277, 2006.
- [19] D. B. Jourdan, D. Dardari, and M. Z. Win, "Position error bound for UWB localization in dense cluttered environments," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 44, no. 2, 2008.
- [20] Z. Yu, Z. Liu, F. Meyer, A. Conti, and M. Z. Win, "Localization based on channel impulse response estimates," in *2020 IEEE/ION Position, Location and Navigation Symposium (PLANS)*, 2020, pp. 1014–1021.
- [21] S. He, B. Ji, and S.-H. G. Chan, "Chameleon: Survey-free updating of a fingerprint database for indoor localization," *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 66–75, 2016.
- [22] C. Steiner and A. Wittneben, "Low complexity location fingerprinting with generalized UWB energy detection receivers," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1756–1767, 2010.
- [23] S. Mazuelas, A. Conti, J. C. Allen, and M. Z. Win, "Soft range information for network localization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 12, pp. 3155–3168, 2018.
- [24] A. Conti, S. Mazuelas, S. Bartoletti, W. C. Lindsey, and M. Z. Win, "Soft information for localization-of-things," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 107, no. 11, pp. 2240–2264, 2019.
- [25] R. M. Buehrer, H. Wymeersch, and R. M. Vaghefi, "Collaborative sensor network localization: Algorithms and practical issues," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 6, pp. 1089–1114, 2018.
- [26] E. Leitinger, F. Meyer, F. Hlawatsch, K. Witrals, F. Tufvesson, and M. Z. Win, "A belief propagation algorithm for multipath-based SLAM," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 18, no. 12, pp. 5613–5629, 2019.
- [27] E. Leitinger, P. Meissner, C. Rüdisser, G. Dumphart, and K. Witrals, "Evaluation of position-related information in multipath components for indoor positioning," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 33, no. 11, pp. 2313–2328, 2015.
- [28] Y. Ge, H. Kim, F. Wen, L. Svensson, S. Kim, and H. Wymeersch, "Exploiting diffuse multipath in 5G SLAM," in *IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, 2020.
- [29] M. Ulmschneider, S. Zhang, C. Gentner, and A. Dammann, "Multipath assisted positioning with transmitter visibility information," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 155 210–155 223, 2020.
- [30] A. F. Molisch, "Ultra-wide-band propagation channels," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 97, no. 2, pp. 353–371, 2009.
- [31] J. Kulmer, S. Grebien, E. Leitinger, and K. Witrals, "Delay estimation in presence of dense multipath," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 1481–1484, 2019.
- [32] F. Wen, J. Kulmer, K. Witrals, and H. Wymeersch, "5G positioning and mapping with diffuse multipath," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 1164–1174, 2020.
- [33] S. Li, M. Hedley, and I. B. Collings, "New efficient indoor cooperative localization algorithm with empirical ranging error model," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 1407–1417, 2015.
- [34] Y. Liu, Y. Shen, D. Guo, and M. Z. Win, "Network localization and synchronization using full-duplex radios," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 714–728, 2018.
- [35] F. Meyer, O. Hlinka, H. Wymeersch, E. Riegler, and F. Hlawatsch, "Distributed localization and tracking of mobile networks including noncooperative objects," *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 57–71, 2015.
- [36] J. Vieira, E. Leitinger, M. Sarajlic, X. Li, and F. Tufvesson, "Deep convolutional neural networks for massive MIMO fingerprint-based positioning," in *IEEE International Symposium on Personal, Indoor, and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC)*. IEEE, 2017.
- [37] C. Li, S. De Bast, E. Tanghe, S. Pollin, and W. Joseph, "Towards fine-grained indoor localization based on massive MIMO-OFDM system: Perspective of multipath components," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14863*, 2021.
- [38] I. Dokmanić, R. Parhizkar, A. Walther, Y. M. Lu, and M. Vetterli, "Acoustic echoes reveal room shape," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 110, no. 30, pp. 12 186–12 191, 2013.
- [39] F. Meyer, A. Tesei, and M. Z. Win, "Localization of multiple sources using time-difference of arrival measurements," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2017, pp. 3151–3155.
- [40] G. Dumphart, "Magneto-inductive communication and localization: Fundamental limits with arbitrary node arrangements," Ph.D. dissertation, ETH Zürich, 2020, Available online: <https://www.research-collection.ethz.ch/handle/20.500.11850/445440>.
- [41] Ahsanullah, *An Introduction to Order Statistics*. Atlantis Press, 2013.
- [42] S. Kay, *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing: Estimation Theory*. Prentice Hall Signal Processing Series, 1993.
- [43] D. Schuhmacher, B.-T. Vo, and B.-N. Vo, "A consistent metric for performance evaluation of multi-object filters," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 56, no. 8, pp. 3447–3457, 2008.
- [44] A. A. Saleh and R. Valenzuela, "A statistical model for indoor multipath propagation," *IEEE Journal on selected areas in communications*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 128–137, 1987.
- [45] Y. Chen, "Evaluating off-the-shelf hardware for indoor positioning," Master's thesis, Lund University, 2017.
- [46] J. Borish, "Extension of the image model to arbitrary polyhedra," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 75, no. 6, pp. 1827–1836, 1984.
- [47] H. A. David and H. N. Nagaraja, *Order statistics*. Wiley, 1970.
- [48] J. E. Gentle, *Computational statistics*. Springer, 2009.
- [49] G. Casella and R. L. Berger, *Statistical inference*. Cengage, 2002.
- [50] R. J. Vaughan and W. N. Venables, "Permanent expressions for order statistic densities," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 308–310, 1972.