

Name: Praneet T.H

SRN: PES1UG23CS439

Section: H

Task 1.1A: Step 1:

```
bash: python3: command not found
seed-attacker:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:/volumes
$> python3 Task1.1A.py
Sniffing packets...
###[ Ethernet ]###
  dst      = b2:4f:cb:d7:51:9a
  src      = 42:0c:3f:83:9e:97
  type     = IPv4
###[ IP ]###
  version  = 4
  ihl      = 5
  tos      = 0x0
  len      = 84
  id       = 13288
  flags    = 0F
  frag     = 0
  ttl      = 64
  proto    = icmp
  chksum   = 0xeca3
  src      = 192.168.228.128
  dst      = 8.8.8.8
  options  \
###[ ICMP ]###
  type     = echo-request
  code     = 0
  chksum   = 0x58cf
  id       = 0x3
  seq      = 0x1
###[ Raw ]###
  load     = '\xf7\x9a\x00\x00\x00\xca\xf9\x00\x00\x00\x00\x10\x11\x12\x13\x14\x15\x16\x17\x18\x19\x1a\x1b\x1c\x1d\x1e\x1f' * 556 + '\x01234567'

###[ Ethernet ]###
  dst      = 42:0c:3f:83:9e:97
  src      = b2:4f:cb:d7:51:9a
  type     = IPv4
###[ IP ]###
  version  = 4
  ihl      = 5
  tos      = 0x0
  len      = 84
  id       = 44803
  flags    =
```

```
$> export PS1="seed-HostA:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:\w\n$> "
seed-HostA:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:/
$> ping 8.8.8.8
PING 8.8.8.8 (8.8.8.8) 56(84) bytes of data.
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=1 ttl=127 time=11.3 ms
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=2 ttl=127 time=11.3 ms
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=3 ttl=127 time=11.8 ms
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=4 ttl=127 time=10.7 ms
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=5 ttl=127 time=10.9 ms
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=6 ttl=127 time=11.2 ms
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=7 ttl=127 time=12.1 ms
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=8 ttl=127 time=12.3 ms
^C
--- 8.8.8.8 ping statistics ---
8 packets transmitted, 8 received, 0% packet loss, time 7011ms
rtt min/avg/max/mdev = 10.748/11.450/12.257/0.505 ms
```

466	632.173832534	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) request	id=0x0004, seq=2/512, ttl=63 (reply in 467)
467	632.184977645	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) reply	id=0x0004, seq=2/512, ttl=128 (request in 466)
468	632.192749950	VMware_c0:00:00	Broadcast	ARP	60 Who has 192.168.228.2? Tell 192.168.228.1	
469	632.888272086	VMware_c0:00:00	Broadcast	ARP	60 Who has 192.168.228.2? Tell 192.168.228.1	
470	633.175353956	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) request	id=0x0004, seq=3/768, ttl=63 (reply in 471)
471	633.186985411	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) reply	id=0x0004, seq=3/768, ttl=128 (request in 470)
472	633.878865203	VMware_c0:00:00	Broadcast	ARP	60 Who has 192.168.228.2? Tell 192.168.228.1	
473	634.176378085	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) request	id=0x0004, seq=4/1024, ttl=63 (reply in 474)
474	634.187603871	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) reply	id=0x0004, seq=4/1024, ttl=128 (request in 473)
475	635.178223406	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) request	id=0x0004, seq=5/1280, ttl=63 (reply in 476)
476	635.189063805	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) reply	id=0x0004, seq=5/1280, ttl=128 (request in 475)
477	636.180395213	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) request	id=0x0004, seq=6/1536, ttl=63 (reply in 478)
478	636.191334501	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) reply	id=0x0004, seq=6/1536, ttl=128 (request in 477)
479	636.411159056	VMware_e5:2b:00	VMware_74:72:2d	ARP	42 Who has 192.168.228.2? Tell 192.168.228.1	
480	636.411408174	VMware_e5:2b:00	VMware_74:72:2d	ARP	60 192.168.228.2 is at 00:50:56:e5:2b:00	
481	637.181763945	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) request	id=0x0004, seq=7/1792, ttl=63 (reply in 482)
482	637.193767468	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) reply	id=0x0004, seq=7/1792, ttl=128 (request in 481)
483	638.183281158	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) request	id=0x0004, seq=8/2048, ttl=63 (reply in 484)
484	638.195426475	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98 Echo (ping) reply	id=0x0004, seq=8/2048, ttl=128 (request in 483)

Here a python file is run in the attacker machine which has scapy's sniff function in it which is used to sniff for packets being transmitted over the network. In host A a ping to 8.8.8.8 executed, during this the reply and response of the host to 8.8.8.8 is being

Step 2:

When the program is run as a non-privileged seed user it fails with a *permission denied* error because sending spoofed ICMP packets requires creating raw sockets, which is a privileged operation in Linux. Only the root user or processes can create raw sockets, as they allow crafting arbitrary packets and bypassing the normal network stack. Since seed lacks these privileges, the script cannot execute successfully.

### Step 3:

### Task 1.1B :Step 1:

[illegible]

```

$> export PS1="seed-HostA:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:\w\n\$> "
seed-HostA:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:/
$> ping 8.8.8.8
PING 8.8.8.8 (8.8.8.8) 56(84) bytes of data.
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=1 ttl=127 time=321 ms
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=2 ttl=127 time=150 ms
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=3 ttl=127 time=166 ms
64 bytes from 8.8.8.8: icmp_seq=4 ttl=127 time=81.0 ms
^C
--- 8.8.8.8 ping statistics ---
15 packets transmitted, 4 received, 73.3333% packet loss, time 14223ms
rtt min/avg/max/mdev = 81.014/179.370/320.568/87.533 ms
seed-HostA:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:/
$>

```

No.	Time	Source	Destination	Protocol	Length	Info
1	0.000000000	Vmware_74:72:2d	Broadcast	ARP	42	Who has 192.168.228.2? Tell 192.168.228.128
2	0.000297597	Vmware_e5:2b:00	Vmware_74:72:2d	ARP	60	192.168.228.2 is at 00:50:56:e5:2b:00
3	0.000393138	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=1/256, ttl=63 (reply in 4)
4	0.320412295	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0005, seq=1/256, ttl=128 (request in 3)
5	1.000344322	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=2/512, ttl=63 (reply in 6)
6	1.150441703	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0005, seq=2/512, ttl=128 (request in 5)
7	2.001597812	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=3/768, ttl=63 (reply in 8)
8	2.167174489	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0005, seq=3/768, ttl=128 (request in 7)
9	3.003342563	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=4/1024, ttl=63 (reply in 10)
10	3.084225392	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0005, seq=4/1024, ttl=128 (request in 9)
11	4.003453466	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=5/1280, ttl=63 (no response found!)
12	5.006512201	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=6/1536, ttl=63 (no response found!)
13	6.030658921	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=7/1792, ttl=63 (reply in 22)
14	7.054825270	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=8/2048, ttl=63 (reply in 23)
15	8.078527086	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=9/2304, ttl=63 (reply in 24)
16	9.102662255	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=10/2560, ttl=63 (reply in 25)
17	10.126587112	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=11/2816, ttl=63 (reply in 26)
18	11.150652305	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0005, seq=12/3072, ttl=63 (no response found!)

In this task the attacker machine's sniffer script was configured with its active network interface and run while Wireshark was simultaneously capturing traffic on the same interface. The script's filter was set to capture only ICMP packets, so when Host A sent ping requests to 8.8.8.8 both the script and Wireshark detected and displayed the ICMP echo request packets leaving Host A as well as the ICMP echo reply packets coming back from the destination. This confirmed that the sniffer was functioning correctly which filtered only ICMP traffic and that Wireshark's capture matched the packets observed by the Scapy sniffer in real time.

Step 2:



```

Cseed-attacker:PE51UG23CS439:Praneet:/volumes
$> python3 Task1.1B-TCP.py
SNIFFING PACKETS...
###[ Ethernet ]###
  dst      = b2:4f:cb:d7:51:9a
  src      = 42:0c:3f:83:9e:97
  type     = IPv4
###[ IP ]###
  version  = 4
  ihl      = 5
  tos      = 0x10
  len      = 60
  id       = 18433
  flags    = DF
  frag     = 0
  ttl      = 64
  proto    = tcp
  chksum   = 0xd88d
  src      = 10.9.0.5
  dst      = 8.8.8.8
  \options
###[ TCP ]###
  sport    = 43804
  dport    = telnet
  seq      = 592812825
  ack      = 0
  dataofs  = 10
  reserved = 0
  flags    = S
  window   = 64240
  chksum   = 0x1a4c
  urgptr   = 0
  options  = [('MSS', 1460), ('SACKOK', b''), ('Timestamp', (3115982397, 0)), ('NOP', None), ('WScale', 7)]

###[ Ethernet ]###
  dst      = b2:4f:cb:d7:51:9a
  src      = 42:0c:3f:83:9e:97
  type     = IPv4
###[ IP ]###
  version  = 4
  ihl      = 5

```

```

$> telnet 8.8.8.8
Trying 8.8.8.8...
telnet: Unable to connect to remote host: Connection refused
Cseed-HostA:PE51UG23CS439:Praneet:/

```

No.	Time	Source	Destination	Protocol	Length	Info
62	73.436958812	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	47838 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=31159835272 TSecr=0 WS=128
63	74.435219558	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 47838 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115936276 TSecr=0 WS=128
64	75.458794861	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 47838 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115937389 TSecr=0 WS=128
65	76.483893367	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 47838 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115938324 TSecr=0 WS=128
66	77.596795558	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 47838 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115939348 TSecr=0 WS=128
67	78.539884697	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 47838 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115940372 TSecr=0 WS=128
70	80.547125317	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 47838 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115942388 TSecr=0 WS=128
71	84.680891659	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 47838 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115946444 TSecr=0 WS=128
72	92.995641875	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 47838 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115954836 TSecr=0 WS=128
73	94.455349667	8.8.8.8	192.168.228.128	TCP	60	23 → 47838 [RST, ACK] Seq=1 Ack=1 Win=64240 Len=0
75	129.556381851	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	43804 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115982397 TSecr=0 WS=128
77	121.517038250	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 43804 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115983412 TSecr=0 WS=128
79	122.595902740	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 43804 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115984436 TSecr=0 WS=128
81	123.619141910	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 43804 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115985460 TSecr=0 WS=128
82	124.643615452	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 43804 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115986484 TSecr=0 WS=128
83	125.667188120	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 43804 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115987508 TSecr=0 WS=128
86	127.682873369	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 43804 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115989524 TSecr=0 WS=128
91	131.987095985	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	TCP	74	[TCP Retransmission] 43804 → 23 [SYN] Seq=0 Win=64240 Len=0 MSS=1460 SACK_PERM TSval=3115993748 TSecr=0 WS=128

In this task the script on the attacker machine was configured with the correct network interface and set to filter only TCP traffic originating from the specific IP address on port 23 (Telnet). With Wireshark capturing on the same interface, the script was run and host A initiated a Telnet connection to 8.8.8.8. Both the Scapy sniffer and Wireshark captured the TCP packets for this session including the three-way handshake (SYN, SYN-ACK, ACK) and subsequent Telnet data packets. This confirmed that the filter was working also isolating only TCP port 23 traffic and that the packets observed by the Python sniffer were consistent with those displayed in Wireshark.

Step 3:

[illegible]

```

seed-HostA: PES1UG23CS439: Praneet:/
$> ping 192.168.254.1
PING 192.168.254.1 (192.168.254.1) 56(84) bytes of data.
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=1 ttl=127 time=74.9 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=2 ttl=127 time=98.1 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=3 ttl=127 time=120 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=4 ttl=127 time=143 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=5 ttl=127 time=166 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=6 ttl=127 time=88.2 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=7 ttl=127 time=109 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=8 ttl=127 time=132 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=9 ttl=127 time=154 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=10 ttl=127 time=74.0 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=11 ttl=127 time=96.2 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=12 ttl=127 time=120 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=13 ttl=127 time=146 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=14 ttl=127 time=164 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=15 ttl=127 time=83.7 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=16 ttl=127 time=107 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=17 ttl=127 time=130 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=18 ttl=127 time=153 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=19 ttl=127 time=83.2 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.254.1: icmp_seq=20 ttl=127 time=94.6 ms
^C
--- 192.168.254.1 ping statistics ---
20 packets transmitted, 20 received, 0% packet loss, time 19027ms
rtt min/avg/max/mdev = 73.960/116.808/166.360/20.527 ms

```

No.	Time	Source	Destination	Protocol	Length	Info
1	0.000000000	192.168.228.128	192.168.254.1	ICMP	58	ping (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=6/1536, ttl=63 (reply in 2)
2	0.087984575	192.168.254.1	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=6/1536, ttl=128 (request in 1)
3	1.001655102	192.168.228.128	192.168.254.1	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=7/1792, ttl=63 (reply in 4)
4	1.118940211	192.168.254.1	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=7/1792, ttl=128 (request in 3)
5	2.003357955	192.168.228.128	192.168.254.1	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=8/2048, ttl=63 (reply in 6)
6	2.05634759	192.168.254.1	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=8/2048, ttl=128 (request in 5)
7	3.005214184	192.168.228.128	192.168.254.1	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=9/2304, ttl=63 (reply in 8)
8	3.159387371	192.168.254.1	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=9/2304, ttl=128 (request in 7)
9	4.006587206	192.168.228.128	192.168.254.1	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=10/2560, ttl=63 (reply in 10)
10	4.080462846	192.168.254.1	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=10/2560, ttl=128 (request in 9)
11	5.003390311	192.168.228.128	192.168.254.1	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=11/2816, ttl=63 (reply in 12)
12	5.104527235	192.168.254.1	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=11/2816, ttl=128 (request in 11)
13	6.009926027	192.168.228.128	192.168.254.1	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=12/3072, ttl=63 (reply in 14)
14	6.129342118	192.168.254.1	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=12/3072, ttl=128 (request in 13)
15	7.011502567	192.168.228.128	192.168.254.1	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=13/3328, ttl=63 (reply in 16)
16	7.187794793	192.168.254.1	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=13/3328, ttl=128 (request in 15)
17	8.017930408	192.168.228.128	192.168.254.1	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=14/3584, ttl=63 (reply in 18)
18	8.177927165	192.168.254.1	192.168.228.128	ICMP	98	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=14/3584, ttl=128 (request in 17)

In this task the script on the attacker machine was configured with the correct network interface and a filter to capture traffic belonging to a chosen subnet (192.168.254.0/24), which was intentionally different from the subnet used by the VM. With Wireshark on the same interface the script was executed and Host A sent ICMP ping requests to

192.168.254.1. The sniffer captured these packets because they matched the specified subnet filter, even though the destination was outside the attacker's active network. Wireshark simultaneously displayed the same ICMP echo request packets (and any replies) confirming that the Python sniffer correctly filtered and displayed only traffic from the targeted subnet.

## Task 1.2:

### Step 1:

```

tos      = 0x0
len      = None
id       = 1
flags    = 0
frag     = 0
ttl      = 64
proto    = icmp
chksum   = None
src      = 10.9.0.1
dst      = 10.9.0.5
\options \
###[ ICMP ]###
type     = echo-request
code     = 0
chksum   = None
id       = 0x0
seq      = 0x0
seed-attacker: PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:/volumes
$> python3 Task1.2A.py
This is a spoofed ICMP packet
###[ IP ]###
version  = 4
ihl      = None
tos      = 0x0
len      = None
id       = 1
flags    = 0
frag     = 0
ttl      = 64
proto    = icmp
chksum   = None
src      = 10.9.0.5
dst      = 10.9.0.6
\options \
###[ ICMP ]###
type     = echo-request
code     = 0
chksum   = None
id       = 0x0
seq      = 0x0

```

No.	Time	Source	Destination	Protocol	Length	Info
16	87.169418079	10.9.0.6	10.9.0.5	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (request in 15)
15	87.169344946	10.9.0.5	10.9.0.6	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (reply in 16)
10	50.152522725	10.9.0.5	10.9.0.1	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (request in 9)
9	50.152491968	10.9.0.1	10.9.0.5	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (reply in 10)
6	10.160516818	10.9.0.5	10.9.0.1	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (request in 5)
5	10.160488589	10.9.0.1	10.9.0.5	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (reply in 6)

In this task the script was run on the attacker machine with Wireshark capturing traffic on the same interface specified in the code. The script used Scapy to craft and send a



spoofed ICMP Echo Request packet setting the source IP to a machine within the local network and the destination IP to an active host on the internet. Since the source address was spoofed any kind of ICMP Echo Reply from the destination was sent to the spoofed machine not the attacker. In Wireshark, the crafted ICMP Echo Request appeared exactly as sent by the script showing the falsified source IP and the intended destination. This demonstrated that the attacker could inject forged packets into the network while the replies would never return to them due to the spoofing.

Step 2:

```
seed-attacker:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:/volumes
$> python3 Task1.2B.py
SENDING SPOOFED ICMP PACKET...
```

###[ IP ]###	Source	Destination	Protocol	Length
version	4	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	Broadcast	42
ihl	= None	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	Broadcast	42
tos	= 0x0	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	ARP	42
len	= None	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	ARP	42
id	= 1	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	ARP	42
flags	=	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	ARP	42
frag	= 0	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	ARP	42
ttl	= 64	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	ARP	42
proto	= icmp	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	ARP	42
chksum	= None	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	ARP	42
src	= 10.9.0.11	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	ARP	42
dst	= 10.9.0.99	62:4f:cb:d7:51:9a	ARP	42

```
\options \
###[ ICMP ]###
type      = echo-request
code      = 0
chksum    = None
id        = 0x0
seq       = 0x0
```

No.	Time	Source	Destination	Protocol	Length	Info
2	2.025448050	10.9.0.11	10.9.0.99	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (no response found!)
5	51.432741306	10.9.0.1	10.9.0.5	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (reply in 6)
6	51.432773548	10.9.0.5	10.9.0.1	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (request in 5)
→ 11	88.556775692	10.9.0.5	10.9.0.6	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (reply in 12)
12	88.556807872	10.9.0.6	10.9.0.5	ICMP	42	Echo (ping) reply id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=64 (request in 11)

In this task the script was executed on the attacker machine while Wireshark captured traffic on the same interface defined in the program. The script generated and sent a spoofed ICMP Echo Request packet with an arbitrary non-existent source IP address and a chosen destination IP. In Wireshark the packet appeared with the fake source address and the real destination confirming that the source field had been successfully falsified. Since the source IP did not correspond to an actual reachable machine no ICMP Echo Reply was observed illustrating how spoofing can disguise the true origin of network traffic.

Task 1.3:

```

seed-attacker:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:/volumes
$> python3 Task1.3.py 8.8.8.8
Traceroute 8.8.8.8
1 hops away: 192.168.228.2
^Cseed-attacker:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:/volumes
$> python3 Task1.3.py 8.8.8.8
Traceroute 8.8.8.8
1 hops away: 192.168.228.2
^Cseed-attacker:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:/volumes
$> python3 Task1.3.py 15.207.29.113
Traceroute 15.207.29.113
1 hops away: 192.168.228.2
^Cseed-attacker:PES1UG23CS439:Praneet:/volumes
$> python3 Task1.3.py 10.9.0.5
Traceroute 10.9.0.5
1 hops away: 10.9.0.5
Done 10.9.0.5

```

6	4.153884765	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	42 Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=1 (no response found!)
7	4.154151768	192.168.228.2	192.168.228.128	ICMP	70 Time-to-live exceeded (time to live exceeded in transit)
8	4.186484573	192.168.228.128	8.8.8.8	ICMP	42 Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=2 (no response found!)
55	199.345488181	192.168.228.128	15.207.29.113	ICMP	42 Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=1 (no response found!)
56	199.345763192	192.168.228.2	192.168.228.128	ICMP	70 Time-to-live exceeded (time to live exceeded in transit)
57	199.378294825	192.168.228.128	15.207.29.113	ICMP	42 Echo (ping) request id=0x0000, seq=0/0, ttl=2 (no response found!)

In this task the script was run on the attacker machine with Wireshark capturing traffic on the same interface specified in the code. The script implemented a basic traceroute using Scapy by sending ICMP Echo Request packets to the target IP address with an incrementally increasing TTL (Time-To-Live) value. Each time a router along the path decremented the TTL to zero it returned an ICMP Time Exceeded message which allows the script to identify that hop. Wireshark displayed the sequence of ICMP Echo Requests leaving the attacker and the corresponding ICMP Time Exceeded responses from intermediate routers, followed by an ICMP Echo Reply from the destination when reached. This confirmed that the program could estimate the hop count and map the route between the attacker and the required destination.

Task 1.4:





source IP set to 1.2.3.4 and the destination IP set to Host A's machine where it copied the identifier, sequence number and payload from the original request. Wireshark displayed the victim's Echo Request to 1.2.3.4 followed immediately by the attacker's forged Echo Reply even though no real host existed at that address. On the victim's terminal the ping appeared successful which mis leded it into believing that 1.2.3.4 was alive. This demonstrated how packet spoofing can falsify network reachability results.

---