CSE Network Security Lab 1

Isaac Ashwin Ravindran 1002151

1 Measurement of Round Trip Times using Ping

1.1 Question 1

For each host, record the percentage of packets sent that resulted in a successful response. Record also the minimum, average, and maximum round trip times for the packets that resulted in a response.

Location	Successful Percentage	Min RTT (ms)	Average RTT (ms)	Max RTT (ms)
www.csail.mit.edu	100%	4.039	5.888	10.466
www.berkeley.edu	100%	202.702	294.037	398.142
www.usyd.edu.au	100%	143.507	200.593	305.575
www.kyoto-u.ac.jp	100%	78.128	102.966	201.455

1.2 Question 2

Describe and explain the differences in the minimum round trip time to each of these hosts.

- www.csail.mit.edu MIT makes use of Pantheon to host their website. It provides distributed hosting across the world, therefore giving very low pings from anywhere. Hence, it has the lowest ping of the lot.
- www.berkeley.edu As this university's website is located in the US, the data needs to travel a very long geographical distance to reach Singapore, therefore resulting in very high ping times.
- www.usyd.edu.au This university, being located in Australia, is closer than Berkeley. Therefore, while high, it's ping times are still lower than Berkeley.
- www.kyoto-u.ac.jp Kyoto University is in Japan, which is still in the same continent and therefore is much closer than the previous 2 universities. Therefore it has the shortest time out of the last 3.

1.3 Question 3

Repeat the exercise using packet sizes of 56, 512 and 1024 bytes. Record the minimum, average, and maximum round trip times for each of the packet sizes.

Location	Packet Size (B)	Successful Percentage	Min RTT (ms)	Average RTT (ms)	Max RTT (ms)
www.csail.mit.edu	56	100%	4.039	5.888	10.466
www.csail.mit.edu	512	100%	4.835	12.877	32.240
www.csail.mit.edu	1024	0%	-	-	-
www.berkeley.edu	56	100%	202.702	294.037	398.142
www.berkeley.edu	512	100%	202.565	262.395	327.723
www.berkeley.edu	1024	0%	-	-	-
www.usyd.edu.au	56	100%	143.507	200.593	305.575
www.usyd.edu.au	512	100%	198.095	271.715	362.179
www.usyd.edu.au	1024	0%	-	-	-
www.kyoto-u.ac.jp	56	100%	78.128	102.966	201.455
www.kyoto-u.ac.jp	512	100%	93.773	138.465	220.646
www.kyoto-u.ac.jp	1024	0%	-	-	-

Why are the minimum round-trip times to the same hosts different when using 56, 512, and 1024-byte packets?

The packets take longer to transmit due to the larger size. Therefore the larger the packet, the longer the minimum RTT.

1.4 Question 4

Use ping to send 100 packets to the following host. Each packet should have a size of 56 bytes, and there should be an interval of 5 seconds between each packet sent.

www.wits.ac.za

Record the percentage of the packets sent that resulted in a successful response.

0%

What are some possible reasons why you may not have received a response?

It is possible that the sysadmin of the University of Witwatersand blocked ICMP on their routers. Therefore ICMP messages do not get sent out, resulting in no response when performing a ping.

2 Understanding Internet Routes Using Traceroute

2.1 Question 5

Explain how traceroute discovers a path to a remote host.

traceroute progressively sends packets with increasing TTLs (starting from 1) until it sends a packet that has a TTL that reaches the intended destination. This way, all intermediate routers/servers/computers will notify the original sender (traceroute program) that the TTL has expired, allowing traceroute to know all the hops along the way.

2.2 Question 6



Figure 1: Traceroute from New York

```
ashtsufagashtsufn:-5 traceroute 96.45.77.1 30 hops max, 60 byte packets
1 gateway (10.12.0.1) 2.22 ns 2.271 ns 3.297 ns
1 gateway (10.12.0.1) 2.22 ns 2.271 ns 3.297 ns
1 gateway (10.12.0.1) 2.222 ns 2.271 ns 3.297 ns
1 gateway (10.12.0.1) 2.222 ns 2.771 ns 3.297 ns
1 gateway (10.12.0.1) 2.655 ns 2.640 ns 2.2660 ns
1 72.161.171 (172.161.101) 2.655 ns 2.640 ns 2.261 ns
4 202.94.70.1 (172.161.101) 2.655 ns 2.640 ns 2.261 ns
4 202.94.70.1 (172.161.101) 2.655 ns 2.640 ns 2.261 ns
5 118.201.75.169 (118.201.75.169) 13.860 ns 203.110.75.177 (103.24.77.1) 10.121 ns 118.201.75.169 (118.201.75.169)
1 18.201.75.169 (118.201.75.169) 13.860 ns 203.101.65.177 (103.24.77.1) 10.121 ns 118.201.75.169 (118.201.75.169) 14.753 ns
6 203.118.12.17 (203.118.12.17) 10.393 ns 14.785 ns 105.21.12.68 (105.21.12.68) 14.433 ns
7 203.118.15.9 (203.118.15.9) 9.285 ns 203.208.190.2 (203.208.190.2)1 7.864 ns 203.118.15.9 (203.118.15.9) 24.032 ns
8 snge-b2-link.telia.net (80.291.13.2.11) 15.276 ns 203.208.190.2 (203.208.190.201.78.160 cs) 203.208.159.2 (203.208.190.201.78.201.78.160 cs) 203.208.159.2 (203.208.190.201.78.160 cs) 203.208.159
```

Figure 2: Traceroute to New York



Figure 3: Traceroute from Amsterdam

```
Ashtswingashtswin:-5 traceroute 213.214.116.98 (213.214.116.98), 30 hops max, 60 byte packets

1 gateway (10.12.0.1) 3.059 ms 3.295 ms 3.275 ms

2 177.16.1.106 (172.16.1.06) (27.16.1.06) 2.913 ms 3.199 ms 3.478 ms

3 172.16.1.210 (172.16.1.210) 3.160 ms 3.137 ms 3.418 ms

4 103.24.77.1 (03.24.477.1) 3.769 ms 3.747 ms 202.94.79.1 (202.94.70.1) 4.004 ms

5 118.201.75.169 (118.201.75.169) 3.979 ms 203.116.245.177 (203.116.245.177) 4.271 ms 118.201.75.169 (118.201.75.169) 4.239 ms

6 203.118.12.17 (203.118.12.17) 7.300 ms 7.392 ms 105.21.12.4 (105.21.12.4) 7.303 ms

7 203.118.2.30 (203.118.12.30) (203.118.2.30) 5.508 ms 203.208.192.105 (203.208.192.105) 4.217 ms 203.118.2.30 (203.118.2.30) 5.439 ms

8 203.208.150.209 (203.208.150.209) 4.408 ms 203.118.12.46 (203.118.12.46) 5.007 ms 203.208.158.209 (203.208.158.209) 4.903 ms

9 1p4.910.conbell.com (80.249.210.149) 213.655 ms 203.208.182.78 (203.208.182.78) 182.180 ms 1p4.910.combell.com (80.249.210.149) 213.862 ms

10 203.208.172.174 (203.208.172.174) 178.972 ms 213.214.116.7 (213.214.116.7) 213.540 ms 203.208.172.174 (203.208.172.174) 191.637 ms
```

Figure 4: Traceroute to Amsterdam



Figure 5: Traceroute from Tokyo

```
ushivsingashivsin-5 traceroute 120.88.53.117 a) 80 hops max, 60 byte packets

1 gateway (10.12.0.1) 3.693 ms 4.107 ms 5.740 ms

2 172.16.1.106 (172.16.1.106) 3.77.07 ms 3.759 ms 3.745 ms

3 172.16.1.210 (172.16.1.220) 4.001 ms 4.641 ms 4.626 ms

4 103.24.77.1 (103.24.77.1) 5.796 ms 5.784 ms 220.94.70.1 (202.94.70.1) 5.766 ms

5 118.201.75.109 (118.201.75.109) 6.072 ms 203.116.245.177 (203.116.245.177) 6.048 ms 118.201.75.109 (118.201.75.109) 6.349 ms

6 203.118.15.19 (203.118.15.29) 10.513 ms 10.470 ms 6.274 ms

8 203.208.158.209 (203.208.158.209) 07.592 ms xe-0-0-0-18.701 topic job.dgin.ntt.net (61.213.145.201) 71.321 ms 203.208.158.209 (203.208.158.209) 60.388 ms

9 ac-9.736.tokyjp05.jp.bb.gin.ntt.net (129.250.3.80) 71.272 ms 203.208.151.253 (203.208.151.253) 6.460 ms ac-9.731.tokyjp05.jp.bb.gin.ntt.net (129.250.3.248) 72.651 ms

10 203.208.158.197 (203.208.158.209) 40.549 ms ac-7.022.tokyjp03.jp.bb.gin.th.tet (127.253.3.701 ps.208.158.209) 60.388 ms
```

Figure 6: Traceroute to Tokyo

2.3 Question 7

Describe anything unusual you might observe about the output. Are the same routers traversed in both directions? If no, why might this be the case?

No, the same routers are not traversed in both directions. Usually, the incoming interface IP address is used in the ICMP error messages, so you see a different IP address while running traceroute in different directions.