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# Executive Summary

This project evaluates the IPv4 and IPv6 network performance of three Linux-based software routers using D-ITG. Performance evaluation, encompassing throughput, delay, jitter, and packet loss, will be conducted across 12 packet sizes on a network comprised of four computers. The project, estimated at 300-360 hours, acknowledges potential risks such as Linux networking experience and hardware limitations, and includes a cost analysis for supervisor support and necessary equipment. Some of the risks and constraints to consider include lack of team experience with Linux networking, possible hardware failure, and potential budget restraints. The total project cost is budgeted at NZD$118,502.57, which covers the hardware, labour, and tools needed for the project. The team has started the Test Execution phase for Ubuntu and are currently working on testing IPv4 with TCP protocol.

# Project Brief

Our client, Dr. Raymond Lutui, has requested an evaluation of the network performance of three Linux-based operating systems (Fedora, Ubuntu, and Kali Linux) configured as software routers, to determine which has the best performance and to compare the data with its previous evaluations. Despite IPv4's acknowledged scalability constraints and IPv6's intended role as a replacement, the limitations of real-world performance data for both protocols hinder network professionals from confidently strategising and executing the transition (Suryaningrat et al., 2016; Narayan et al., 2016). This project addresses the lack of real-world data by undertaking performance testing using D-ITG across different packet sizes over IPv4 and IPv6 within a four PC network topology. The project commences on April 4, 2025, with final deliverables due on October 31, 2025.

# Project Overview

The goal of this project is to evaluate the performance of three Linux-based Operating Systems – Fedora, Ubuntu, and Kali. These operating systems need to be configured as software routers on two of four computers in an isolated network. The tool D-ITG is to be employed to generate the evaluation traffic. The project follows the Software Testing Life Cycle (STLC) methodology, to evaluate network throughput, delay, jitters, and packet loss for TCP and UDP transmissions on IPv4 and IPv6 protocols within a 95% confidence interval over ten runs per packet size.

# Risk and Issues

The team have continued to update the Risk Register and Issue log as needed. As expected, sickness and transport issues have been the most common, impacting both team and client meetings. We have managed these instances with catch-up sessions online. We have also identified new major risks:

* Fatigue and burnout, Inaccurate or invalid performance results, and inconsistent format/ presentation of results across operating systems.

A full list of all updated risks can be found in Risk Register v2.

# Proposal Feedback / Recommendations

The team has carefully considered and appropriately addressed the feedback and recommendations received during our proposal presentation. Team members were assigned in pairs to work on refining the original proposals by implementing the changes for improvement. The completion work of assigned tasks was later peer-reviewed within the team to ensure the work meets the high standards of quality, accuracy and credibility following the quality assurance plan. The following table shows the list of feedback and recommendations our team has received for the proposal.

# Proposal Improvement

The following table below shows the changes implemented based on the feedback and recommendations for our proposal document.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Original Proposal** | **Revised Proposal** | **Reason for changes** |
| **Scope Statement:**  Functional Requirements  **R7.** Generate network traffic using D-ITG or iPerf  **R11.** Record throughput performance across all evaluation scenarios  **R12.** All evaluations must be run 10 times each with all evaluations at 95% confidence  **R13.** Measure network delays in all evaluation configurations  **R14.** Calculate jitter values throughout evaluations  **R15.** Track packet loss rates for all evaluation cases  **R16.** Log all evaluations | **R7.** Generate network traffic using D-ITG  **R11.** Record performance across all test scenarios for delay, jitter, throughput and packet loss  **R12.** Log all evaluations in Excel spreadsheet  **R13.** Generate visual graphs which shows average performance metrics for all packet sizes | Improved Functional requirements and removed repetitive functional requirements |
| **Non-Functional Requirements:** Missing some key requirements. | **R12**. Clock across all 4 computers must be synchronised  **R13.** Finding the optimal value for packet rate  **R14.** To keep each run 10 seconds | Added relevant non-functional requirements |
| **Out of Scope:**  **R3**. Comparison data must allow for direct analysis between operating systems  **R15**. Addressing performance issues identified during evaluation  **R17**. Troubleshooting underlying hardware issues | The 3 requirements shown on left hand side has been removed. | Removed irrelevant out of scopes |
| **Project Scope:**  Each configuration will undergo 10 evaluation runs to ensure statistical validity, with additional runs conducted for any results falling outside the 95% confidence interval. | The evaluation runs involve the sender to initiate the packet sending in specified network topology to receiver. Each evaluation runs use DITG to generate traffic for 10 seconds with different packet rates and logs will be decoded to export the average performance metrics. | Added more specific details on each evaluation testing |
| **Project Phases:**  Requirement Analysis, Evaluation Planning, Evaluation Case Development, Evaluation Environment Setup, Evaluation Execution, Evaluation Closure. | Requirement Analysis, Test Planning, Test Case Development, Test Environment Setup, Test Execution, Test Closure. | All project phase names have been reverted to their original terminology from the STLC framework for clarity and consistency. |
| **Quality Assurance:** QA/QC plan can be clearer on how it integrates with the methodology | QA/QC Walkthrough Procedures by Project Phase table has been modified to relate back to project management methodology along with the project phases link to the QA is well | Comments based on proposal review indicated the QA plan didn't link strongly to STLC |
| **WBS:** High Level Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) shows the 6 phases along with the milestones. | The initial WBS was modified to show more technical aspect of the project as well as to show iteration between the Test Environment Setup and Test Execution phases for each of the operating systems. | The WBS Diagram needed to show iteration and milestones. |
| **Gantt Chart:** Reworked based on revised WBS and project feedback. | WIP. | Work in progress (to be finished for final submission of mid-term review). |
| **Project Feasibility:**  Original project feasibility section did not have references to quality assurance. | To ensure the project remains feasible throughout its lifecycle, we apply structured quality assurance measures. For full details, please refer to the Quality Assurance Plan in Appendix T. This includes:   * Tool validation to confirm D-ITG work across all Linux systems. * Structured upskilling to ensure team is prepared. * Peer-reviewed configurations to reduce errors and ensure consistency. * Requiring all results to meet the 95% confidence interval with re-tests for all outliers.   The QA plan has also been updated to reflect this, please refer to Appendix (**ENTER HERE)** for the full plan. | Feedback from proposal emphasised the need for quality assurance of the project feasibility. |
| **QA Plan:**  Section 6.0  evaluation case template, router configuration checklist, evaluation log template, bug report form, peer review checklist | Router configuration checklist, evaluation log template, peer review checklist. | Evaluation Case template and Bug Report form were removed from the QA Plan to avoid duplication. Evaluation procedures are detailed in the Requirement Traceability Matrix and project phases, while all issues will be logged into the Issue Log. |
| **Estimated Costs:** Original estimate assumed four monitors, four keyboards/mice, and 6 NICs.Total was NZD$118,774.71. | Costs reduced:  6 NICs -> 2 NICs  4 monitors -> 3 monitors  4 keyboards/mice -> 3 keyboards/mice  Now down to NZD$118,502.57. | PC motherboards have NICs on-board so only 2 extras needed.  SSH or swapping peripherals can be used for setting up either or both routers since they don’t need independent operation during evaluations.  Whilst it’s possible to reduce costs further using only SSH, having one set of peripherals for the routers is preferable for troubleshooting. |

# Project Status

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Phases | Planned Completion | Actual Status | Explanation |
| Requirement Analysis | 11/04/25 | Completed on Time | Proposal was successfully submitted by scheduled date. The project's objectives, methodology and scope were clearly outlined. |
| Test Planning | TBC | TBC | Not sure if separate Test Plan is necessary or if RTM is adequate. Will be addressed before final mid-term review submission. |
| Test Case Development | 01/05/2025 | Completed | Virtual machines were set up and all three Linux operating systems were installed to assess performance. |
| Test Environment Setup: Ubuntu | 01/05/2025 | Completed | To begin testing, evaluation environments were set up, updated, and connected to the internet. |
| Test Execution: Ubuntu | 15/05/2025 | Completed | D-ITG for TCP and UDP under IPv4 was used to do sample evaluation runs on Ubuntu. |
| Test Closure | 03/07/2025 | Currently work in progress | Team started the execution process earlier than planned and have completed IPv4 TCP evaluations for Ubuntu. Data analysis is currently ongoing, then UDP will be done, before closing out this milestone. |
|  | 08/06/2025 | Draft Completed | Ready for review by supervisor. Appendices to be added, and some details such as team hours are still to be filled out. |
|  | (sem 2, add dates here) | Yet to be begin | Ubuntu evaluation has taken us the length of semester 1 due to certain hurdles to overcome, those included hardware / software issues related to the pc. |
|  | (sem 2, add dates here) | Yet to begin | Kali is the last evaluation after fedora, so once fedora is complete only then can Kali testing begin. |

The evaluation of Ubuntu started two months ahead of schedule but was delayed due to the team’s misunderstandings of how the evaluations should be conducted to gather accurate results. However, the team was able to diagnose and resolve this problem as it was caught early in the process, thus hopefully preventing similar problems for the rest of the project. Therefore, the entirety of the project schedule has been slightly shortened, despite the Ubuntu evaluation taking longer overall.

Documentation of the processes during the Ubuntu evaluation was lacking due to workload imbalance between team members and subpar delegation.

This is a difficult, non-stop balancing act in team projects, but the team is actively working on improving these issues, as shown in the *Recommendation on Team Performance Improvement* section.

# Team Contribution & Skills Learnt

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Team Members** | **Tasks Completed** | **Skills Learnt** | **Time Spent** |
| Thomas Robinson | * Executive Summary * Terms of Reference * Project Scope * Project Feasibility * Network Diagram * Estimated Costs * Upskilling Plan Schedule * Requirement Traceability Matrix * Work Breakdown Structure * Referencing * Meeting Agendas (Part 1) * Initial scripting for all evaluations * OS installations * Network configuration * Project Overview * Project Status | * Netplan * Linux router configuration * Chrony configuration * How to use D-ITG | ~120 hours  (Details to be added) |
| Win Phyo | * Team Contract * Scope Statement * WBS * Meeting Minutes * Project Proposal * Proposal Presentation Slides * Scripting * Data Analysis on DITG * IPv4 TCP Ubuntu Running Evaluations * Project Status Report | * Bash scripting * Chrony Configuration * D-ITG * Linux Network Configuration * Communication Skills * Data logging and analysis |  |
| Nathan Quai Hoi | * Stakeholder Register * Stakeholder Management Plan * Network Diagram * Gantt Chart * Multiple contributions to proposal document * Configuration of Pcs/Routers * Data Analysis of the D-ITG Data (on Excel) | * Hardware / Configuration Ubuntu Router * BASH scripting to automate runs * Initial Project Management Skills * Excel formula knowledge to help automate calculations * Bit of python to automate the dat files into excel files * D-ITG | * To be added |
| Zafar Azad | * Issue Log V1 * Risk Register V1 * Methodology Comparison * Methodology Breakdown * Project Phases * Octave Graphing * IPv6 D-ITG Script | * IPv6 D-ITG scripting * Hardware setup ubuntu * Octave |  |
| Larissa Goh | * Risk Register V1 & V2 * Issue Log V1 & V2 * Quality Assurance Plan V1 & V2 * Milestone Report V1 * Labour Breakdown * Meeting Minutes (Enter Which Ones Later) | * BASH scripting * MATLAB basics & scripting * Linux Familiarity * Adaptability, giving and receiving feedback, time management, collaboration |  |
| Charmi Patel | * Communication Plan V1 * Estimated Costs * Proposal Presentation Slides * Conflict Resolution Plan * Project Status | * Linux Familiarity * BASH scripting * MATLAB basics |  |
| Kylie Afable | * Tools comparison * Proposal presentation slides * Meeting Minutes 28/05/2025 * Terms of Reference * IPv4 Assessing runs | * BASH scripting * Linux familiarity * Networking basics |  |

# Recommendation on Team Performance Improvement

The following list shows the recommendations for improving our team performance and maintaining consistent collaboration with open and respectful communication.

* Encourage team members to be more active and engaging in our online Discord server to enhance communication and improve collaboration.
* Improved work allocation to allow equal sharing of workload.
* Encourage team members to take initiative in doing tasks or ask what needs to be done.
* Encourage team members to provide updates on tasks they have been assigned so that everyone knows what is being done and can assist if needed.

# Summary of Client and Mentor Meetings

During our phase one, our team planned to have regular weekly meetings with the client and mentor. We transitioned to fortnightly meetings from the second phase onwards. In total, we conducted 6 meetings with the client and mentor with a total duration of 6 hours. This is only slightly less than expected, as our kick-off meeting in week 2 was pushed to week 3, as the time scheduled conflicted with our first workshop. As we move into part 2 of our project, we aim to schedule client further in advance, rather than just a few days out. Our Team meeting schedules remain the same and is shown in the following table. A white grid with yellow and green squares
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