Assignment 6

Team members:

Tanmay M Saurav, Roll:22210062

Tanmay Somkuwar, Roll:23210112

1.Question

a) Implementation:

Topology setup: Three routers (ra, rb, and rc) connect hosts h1 and h2 to ra through switch s1, hosts h3 and h4 to rb via switch s2, and hosts h5 and h6 to rc through switch s3, while the routers are interconnected through switch s4.

IP Configurations:

```
- 192.168.1.0/24 (ra-h1-h2, IP: 192.168.1.{1, 100, 101})
```

```
- 192.168.2.0/24 (rb-h3-h4, IP: 192.168.2.{1, 100, 101})
```

- 192.168.3.0/24 (rc-h5-h6, IP: 192.168.3.{1, 100, 101})
- 192.168.4.0/24 (ra-rb-rc, IP: 192.168.4.{1, 100, 101})

Working with the network topology:


We have successfully set up routers (ra, rb, and rc), switches (s1, s2, s3, and s4), and hosts (h1, h2, h3, h4, h5, and h6). As part of our validation process, we conducted a ping test between all hosts and routers to confirm the proper functionality and communication within the network:

Dumping:-

```
mininet> pingall
*** Ping: testing ping reachability
h1 -> h2 h3 h4 h5 h6 ra rb rc
h2 -> h1 h3 h4 h5 h6 ra rb rc
h3 -> h1 h2 h4 h5 h6 ra rb rc
h4 -> h1 h2 h3 h5 h6 ra rb rc
h5 -> h1 h2 h3 h4 h6 ra rb rc
h6 -> h1 h2 h3 h4 h5 ra rb rc
ra -> h1 h2 h3 h4 h5 h6 rb rc
rb -> h1 h2 h3 h4 h5 h6 ra rc
rc -> h1 h2 h3 h4 h5 h6 ra rb
*** Results: 0% dropped (72/72 received)
mininet> dump
<Host h1: h1-eth0:192.168.1.100 pid=4091>
<Host h2: h2-eth0:192.168.1.101 pid=4093>
<Host h3: h3-eth0:192.168.2.100 pid=4095>
<Host h4: h4-eth0:192.168.2.101 pid=4097>
<Host h5: h5-eth0:192.168.3.100 pid=4099>
<Host h6: h6-eth0:192.168.3.101 pid=4101>
<LinuxRouter ra: ra-eth1:192.168.1.1,ra-eth2:192.168.4.1 pid=4105>
<LinuxRouter rb: rb-eth1:192.168.2.1,rb-eth2:192.168.4.2 pid=4107>
<LinuxRouter rc: rc-eth1:192.168.3.1,rc-eth2:192.168.4.3 pid=4109>
<OVSSwitch s1: lo:127.0.0.1,s1-eth1:None,s1-eth2:None,s1-eth3:None pid=4114>
<OVSSwitch s2: lo:127.0.0.1,s2-eth1:None,s2-eth2:None,s2-eth3:None pid=4117>
<OVSSwitch s3: lo:127.0.0.1,s3-eth1:None,s3-eth2:None,s3-eth3:None pid=4120>
<0VSSwitch s4: lo:127.0.0.1,s4-eth1:None,s4-eth2:None,s4-eth3:None pid=4123>
<Controller c0: 127.0.0.1:6653 pid=4084>
```

```
mininet> h1 ping -c 4 h3
PING 192.168.2.100 (192.168.2.100) 56(84) bytes of data.
64 bytes from 192.168.2.100: icmp_seq=1 ttl=62 time=13.9 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.2.100: icmp_seq=2 ttl=62 time=6.00 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.2.100: icmp_seq=3 ttl=62 time=1.12 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.2.100: icmp_seq=4 ttl=62 time=0.061 ms
 -- 192.168.2.100 ping statistics
4 packets transmitted, 4 received, 0% packet loss, time 3007ms
rtt min/avg/max/mdev = 0.061/5.266/13.876/5.452 ms
mininet> h1 ping -c 4 h6
PING 192.168.3.101 (192.168.3.101) 56(84) bytes of data.
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seq=1 ttl=62 time=14.9 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seq=2 ttl=62 time=3.09 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seg=3 ttl=62 time=0.448 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seq=4 ttl=62 time=0.104 ms
--- 192.168.3.101 ping statistics ---
4 packets transmitted, 4 received, 0% packet loss, time 3018ms
rtt min/avg/max/mdev = 0.104/4.638/14.912/6.042 ms
mininet>
```

Upon initiating tcpdump through Wireshark at routers ra, rb, and rc, specifically examining the ra_dump.pcap file, the analysis reveals that, after pinging from host h1 to h3, the process commences with an ARP request from 192.168.1.100 (h1) to determine 'who has 192.168.1.1?'. Subsequently, an ARP reply containing the MAC address is received. The packet transmission ensues from 192.168.1.100 (h1) to 192.168.2.100 (h3), with replies reciprocated from 192.168.2.100 to 192.168.1.100 via router ra.




c) Comparing latency differences between default and changed route.

```
*** Starting CLI:
mininet> ra ip route
192.168.1.0/24 dev ra-eth1 proto kernel scope link src 192.168.1.1
192.168.2.0/24 via 192.168.4.2 dev ra-eth2
192.168.3.0/24 via 192.168.4.3 dev ra-eth2
192.168.4.0/24 dev ra-eth2 proto kernel scope link src 192.168.4.1
mininet> ra ip route del 192.168.3.0/24
mininet> ra ip route add 192.168.3.0/24 via 192.168.4.2 dev ra-eth2
mininet> ra ip route
192.168.1.0/24 dev ra-eth1 proto kernel scope link src 192.168.1.1
192.168.2.0/24 via 192.168.4.2 dev ra-eth2
192.168.3.0/24 via 192.168.4.2 dev ra-eth2
192.168.4.0/24 dev ra-eth2 proto kernel scope link src 192.168.4.1
mininet> h1 traceroute h6
traceroute to 192.168.3.101 (192.168.3.101), 30 hops max, 60 byte packets
1 192.168.1.1 (192.168.1.1) 7.462 ms 7.987 ms 8.085 ms
2
   192.168.4.2 (192.168.4.2)
                                16.138 ms 17.506 ms 19.843 ms
3
   192.168.4.3 (192.168.4.3) 29.138 ms 31.784 ms 33.183 ms
   192.168.3.101 (192.168.3.101) 38.076 ms
                                               40.750 ms
                                                           41.021 ms
mininet> h1 ping -c 4 h6
PING 192.168.3.101 (192.168.3.101) 56(84) bytes of data.
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seg=1 ttl=62 time=4.68 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seq=2 ttl=62 time=23.3 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seq=3 ttl=62 time=0.642 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seq=4 ttl=62 time=0.117 ms
  - 192.168.3.101 ping statistics -
4 packets transmitted, 4 received, 0% packet loss, time 3021ms
tt min/avg/max/mdev = 0.117/7.176/23.265/9.455 ms
mininet> iperf h1 h6
*** Iperf: testing TCP bandwidth between h1 and h6
** Results: ['2.56 Gbits/sec', '2.58 Gbits/sec']
```

```
--- 192.168.3.101 ping statistics ---
4 packets transmitted, 4 received, 0% packet loss, time 3021ms
rtt min/avg/max/mdev = 0.117/7.176/23.265/9.455 ms
mininet> iperf h1 h6
*** Iperf: testing TCP bandwidth between h1 and h6
*** Results: ['2.56 Gbits/sec', '2.58 Gbits/sec']
mininet> ra ip route del 192.168.3.0/24
mininet> ra ip route add 192.168.3.0/24 via 192.168.4.2 dev ra-eth2
mininet> h1 ping -c 4 h6
PING 192.168.3.101 (192.168.3.101) 56(84) bytes of data.
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seq=1 ttl=62 time=5.46 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seq=2 ttl=62 time=18.1 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seq=2 ttl=62 time=0.416 ms
64 bytes from 192.168.3.101: icmp_seq=4 ttl=62 time=0.122 ms
--- 192.168.3.101 ping statistics ---
4 packets transmitted, 4 received, 0% packet loss, time 3016ms
rtt min/avg/max/mdev = 0.122/6.032/18.130/7.299 ms
mininet>
```

d) Dumping routing tables:



PART II

We established a network configuration with four hosts, namely h1, h2, h3, and h4. Additionally, there are two switches, labeled s1 and s2. The connections are set up as follows: h1 and h2 are linked to switch s1, while h3 and h4 are connected to switch s2. Furthermore, switches s1 and s2 are interconnected.

IP of the hosts: h1: 10.0.0.1/24 h2: 10.0.0.2/24 h3: 10.0.0.3/24 h4: 10.0.0.4/24

(a)

```
*** Creating network

*** Adding controller

*** Adding hosts:
h1 h2 h3 h4

*** Adding switches:
s1 s2

*** Adding links:
(2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h1, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h2, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h3, s2) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h4, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 0.00000% loss) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 0.00000% loss) (s1, s2)

*** Configuring hosts
h1 h2 h3 h4

*** Starting controller

c0

*** Starting 2 switches
s1 s2 ... (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 0.00000% loss) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 del

ay 0.00000% loss)

*** Maiting for switches to connect
s1 s2 ...

Client connecting to 10.0.0 4, TCP port 5001
TCP window size: 85.3 KByte (default)

TCP window size: 85.3 KByte (default)

[ 3] local 10.0.1 port 50910 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001
[ 10] Interval Transfer Bandwidth
[ 3] 0.0-10.4 sec 10.2 MBytes 8.27 Mbits/sec

*** Starting CLI:
mininet> ■
```

(b) reno

Cubic

```
mininet@mininet-vm: $ sudo python topo2.py --config b --cc cubic

*** Creating network

*** Adding controller

*** Adding hosts:

11 h2 h3 h4

*** Adding switches:

51 52

*** Adding links:

(2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h1, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h2, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (

13, s2) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h4, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 0.00000% loss) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 0.00000% loss) (s1, s2)

*** Configuring hosts

11 h2 h3 h4

*** Starting 2 switches

51 s2 ...(2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 0.00000% loss) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 0.00000% loss)

*** Waiting for switches to connect

51 s2

Client connecting to 10.0.0.4, TCP port 5001

TCP window size: 85.3 KByte (default)

[ 3] local 10.0.0.1 port 58926 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001

[ 10] Interval Transfer Bandwidth

[ 3] 0.0-11.2 sec 4.50 MBytes 3.37 Mbits/sec

*** Starting CLI:

mininet>
```

Bbr

Reasoning of the throughput:

The throughput variations observed among different Congestion Control Algorithms (CCAs) arise from their distinct approaches to managing network congestion. Each CCA adjusts transmission rates based on network conditions, influencing overall throughput.

Reno: Serving as the default TCP CCA, Reno adopts a loss-based strategy, decreasing transmission rates upon detecting packet loss. Although straightforward, its conservative rate reduction might constrain throughput in congested networks. The iperf test methodology, however, may have unintentionally favored Reno, resulting in higher observed throughput.

Vegas: Vegas takes into account both packet loss and delay information to estimate congestion, allowing for more precise rate adjustments compared to Reno. Nevertheless, the iperf test methodology may not have favored Reno, leading to a comparatively lower throughput for Vegas.

Cubic: Cubic combines loss, delay, and packet arrival times for congestion estimation, enabling faster rate adjustments than Vegas. This could elucidate its higher throughput compared to Vegas.

BBR: Google's BBR CCA relies on a delay-based approach, using a network model to estimate the optimal sending rate. While BBR can achieve high throughput in networks with high latency or packet loss, its implementation complexity may impact its use. Additionally, the iperf testing methodology may have negatively influenced the observed throughput for BBR.

(c):

To run clients h1, h2, and h3 simultaneously on server h4, we initiated the iperf server on h4. Next, we established three threads corresponding to h1, h2, and h3, serving as clients to h4. These threads were concurrently executed during the active network period, with all functionalities defined within the run() function.

reno

```
waiting for switches to connect
s1 s2
Running hosts simultaneously
Iperf throughput from h3 to H4 with {'reno'}:
Client connecting to 10.0.0.4, TCP port 5001 TCP window size: 85.3 KByte (default)
[ 3] local 10.0.0.3 port 34800 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001
[ ID] Interval Transfer Bandwidth
[ 3] 0.0-10.9 sec 2.12 MBytes 1.63 Mbits/sec
Iperf throughput from h2 to H4 with {'reno'}:
Client connecting to 10.0.0.4, TCP port 5001
TCP window size: 85.3 KByte (default)
[ 3] local 10.0.0.2 port 56242 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001
[ ID] Interval Transfer Bandwidth
[ 3] 0.0-11.8 sec 1.88 MBytes 1.33 Mbits/sec
Iperf throughput from h1 to H4 with {'reno'}:
Client connecting to 10.0.0.4, TCP port 5001
TCP window size: 85.3 KByte (default)
[ 3] local 10.0.0.1 port 58942 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001
[ ID] Interval Transfer Bandwidth
[ 3] 0.0-12.3 sec 2.12 MBytes 1.45 Mbits/sec
Ping latency from h3 to H4 with {'reno'}:
PING 10.0.0.4 (10.0.0.4) 56(84) bytes of data.
64 bytes from 10.0.0.4: icmp_seq=1 ttl=64 time=3756 ms
```

```
*** Starring 2 switches
s1 s2 ...(2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 0.00000% loss) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 del
ay 0.00000% loss)
*** Waiting for switches to connect
s1 s2
Running hosts simultaneously
Iperf throughput from h2 to H4 with {'vegas'}:
Client connecting to 10.0.0.4, TCP port 5001
TCP window size: 85.3 KByte (default)
  3] local 10.0.0.2 port 56254 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001
ID] Interval Fransfer Bandwidth
3] 0.0-10.1 sec 1.62 MBytes 1.35 Mbits/sec
 [perf throughput from h3 to H4 with {'vegas'}:
3] local 10.0.0.3 port 34810 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001
ID] Interval Fransfer Bandwidth
3] 0.0-11.0 sec 1.88 MBytes 1.43 Mbits/sec
 perf throughput from h1 to H4 with {'vegas'}:
3] local 10.0.0.1 port 58956 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001
ID] Interval Transfer Bandwidth
3] 0.0-11.9 sec 2.12 MBytes 1.50 Mbits/sec
```

Cubic

Bbr

```
### Walting for switches to connect
il 52

Iperf throughput from h3 to H4 with {'bbr'}:

Client connecting to 10.0.0.4, TCP port 5001

TCP window size: 85.3 kByte (default)

[ 3] local 10.0.0.3 port 34834 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001

ID] Interval Transfer Bandwidth
[ 3] 0.0-11.5 sec 2.12 MBytes 1.55 Mbits/sec

Iperf throughput from h2 to H4 with {'bbr'}:

Client connecting to 10.0.0.4, TCP port 5001

TCP window size: 85.3 kByte (default)

[ 3] local 10.0.0.2 port 56276 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001

ID] Interval Transfer Bandwidth
[ 3] 0.0-12.3 sec 2.12 MBytes 1.45 Mbits/sec

Iperf throughput from h1 to H4 with {'bbr'}:

Client connecting to 10.0.0.4, TCP port 5001

TCP window size: 85.3 kByte (default)

[ 3] local 10.0.0.1 port 58982 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001

TCP window size: 85.3 kByte (default)

[ 3] local 10.0.0.1 port 58982 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001

TCP window size: 85.3 kByte (default)

[ 3] 0.0-12.5 sec 2.12 MBytes 1.43 Mbits/sec
```

Summary of the schemes:

Scheme	Source	Throughput	File Transferred
reno	h1->h4	1.63 Mb/s	2.12 MB

reno	h2->h4	1.33 Mb/s	1.88 MB
reno	h3->h4	1.45 Mb/s	2.12 MB
vegas	h1->h4	1.35 Mb/s	1.62 MB
vegas	h2->h4	1.43 Mb/s	1.88 MB
vegas	h3->h4	1.5 Mb/s	2.12 MB
cubic	h1->h4	1.54 Mb/s	2.12 MB
cubic	h2->h4	1.52 Mb/s	2.12 MB
cubic	h3->h4	1.42 Mb/s	2.12 MB
bbr	h1->h4	1.55 Mb/s	2.12 MB
bbr	h2->h4	1.45 Mb/s	2.12 MB
bbr	h3->h4	1.43 Mb/s	2.12 MB

(d)

Reno with 1% loss

```
mininet@mininet-vm: $ sudo python topo2.py --config b --loss 1 --cc reno

*** Creating network

*** Adding controller

*** Adding hosts:
h1 h2 h3 h4

*** Adding switches:
s1 s2

*** Adding links:
(2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h1, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h2, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h3, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (0.00Mbit 2 delay)
```

Reno with 3% loss

```
*** Creating network
*** Adding controller
*** Adding switches:
11 52
*** Adding switches:
12 2
*** Adding links:
(2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h1, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h2, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (n3, s2) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (n4, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay) (n5, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay) (n6, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay) (n6, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay) (n7, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay) (n8, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay) (n8, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 delay) (n8, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit
```

Vegas with 1% loss

```
mininatDmininet-vm:-$ sudo python topo2.py --config b --loss 1 --cc vegas

*** Creating network

*** Adding controller

*** Adding controller

*** Adding switches:
11 h2 h3 h4

*** Adding switches:
11 s2

*** Adding switches:
12 cell substitutes:
12 cell substitutes:
13 cell substitutes:
13 cell substitutes:
14 cell substitutes:
15 cell substitutes:
16 cell substitutes:
17 cell substitutes:
18 cell substi
```

Vegas with 3% loss

Cubic with 1% loss

```
mininet@mininet-vm: $ sudo python topo2.py --config b --loss 1 --cc cubic

*** Creating network

*** Adding controller

*** Adding hosts:
h1 2b 3h H4

*** Adding switches:
s1 s2

*** Adding links:
(2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h1, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h2, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h3, s2) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h4, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 1.00000% loss) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 1.00000% loss) (s1, s2)

*** Configuring hosts
h1 h2 h3 h4

*** Starting controller

*** Starting controller

*** Starting 2 switches
s1 s2 ...(2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 1.00000% loss) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 delay)

*** Waiting for switches to connect
s1 s2 ...

Client connecting to 10.0.0.4, TCP port 5001
TCP window size: 85.3 kByte (default)

[ 3] local 10.0.0.1 port 59774 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001
[ 10] Interval Transfer Bandwidth
[ 3] 0.0-10.3 sec 2.62 MBytes 2.14 Mbits/sec
```

```
*** Done
mininet@mininet-vm:-$ sudo python topo2.py --config b --loss 3 --cc cubic

*** Creating network

*** Adding controller

*** Adding hosts:
hl h2 h3 h4

*** Adding switches:
sl s2

*** Adding links:
(2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h1, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h2, s1) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (
h3, s2) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (h4, s2) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 3.00000% loss) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 3.00000% loss) (s1, s2)

*** Configuring hosts
hl h2 h3 h4

*** Starting controller

c0

*** Starting 2 switches
sl s2 ...(2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 3.00000% loss) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (2.00Mbit 2 delay) (8.00Mbit 2 delay 3.00000% loss)

*** Waiting for switches to connect
sl s2 ...

Client connecting to 10.0.0.4, TCP port 5001

TCD window size: 85.3 kByte (default)

[ 3] local 10.0.0.1 port 59782 connected with 10.0.0.4 port 5001

[ 10] Interval Transfer Bandwidth
[ 3] 0.0-10.3 sec 2.50 MBytes 2.04 Mbits/sec

*** Starting CLI:
mininet>
```

Bbr with 1% loss

Summary of the results: (h1->h4)

Scheme	Throughput	Transferred Data
RENO (with no loss)	7.51 Mbits/sec	9.38 MB
RENO (with 1% loss)	2.09 Mbits/sec	2.62 MB
RENO (with 3% loss)	2.32 Mbits/sec	2.88 MB
VEGAS (with no loss)	2.13 Mbits/sec	2.62 MB
VEGAS (with 1% loss)	2.16 Mbits/sec	2.62 MB
VEGAS (with 3% loss)	1.86 Mbits/sec	2.25 MB
CUBIC (with no loss)	3.42 Mbits/sec	4.62 MB
CUBIC (with 1% loss)	2.14 Mbits/sec	2.62 MB
CUBIC (with 3% loss)	2.04 Mbits/sec	2.50 MB
BBR (with no loss)	2.03 Mbits/sec	2.50 MB
BBR (with 1% loss)	2.03 Mbits/sec	2.50 MB
BBR (with 3% loss)	1.99 Mbits/sec	2.38 MB

In the case of Reno, notable reductions in throughput are evident with 1% and 3% losses on the link. Vegas, on the other hand, experiences a slight decrease in throughput only with a 3% loss on the link, while at 1% loss, throughput remains comparable. Cubic demonstrates reduced throughput with both 1% and 3% losses on the link. However, for BBR, the impact of 1% and 3% losses on the link

is not substantial.