50.005 Lab #5

Q1: 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.

Website	Successful	Min RTT (ms)	Average RTT	Max RTT (ms)
	Percentage (%)		(ms)	
www.csail.mit.edu	100	5.557	7.336	10.452
www.berkeley.edu	100	213.461	270.683	321.709
www.usyd.edu.au	100	227.929	299.743	417.758
www.kyoto-u.ac.jp	100	81.805	99.320	126.517

Q2: Describe & explain the differences in the minimum round trip to each of these hosts

The trend of increasing RTT goes from MIT to Kyoto-u to Berkeley and to USYD. Theoretically, the further the destination is from SUTD, the longer the propagation time. Kyoto (Japan) is much nearer to us than Berkeley and USYD and thus has a much faster RTT. One anomaly is the RTT to MIT which is expected to be longer than Kyoto-u but ends up being way faster than the rest.

Q3: 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. Why are the minimum round-trip times to the same hosts different when using 56, 512, and 1024-byte packets?

Website	Data Byte	Successful	Min RTT	Average RTT	Max RTT
	Packet	Percentage	(ms)	(ms)	(ms)
		(%)			
www.csail.mit.edu	56	100	6.124	7.982	11.532
	512	100	6.547	11.132	22.377
	1024	100	6.721	15.092	28.198
www.berkeley.edu	56	100	214.289	271.997	323.871
	512	100	211.415	278.058	331.812
	1024	100	215.219	277.638	412.297
www.usyd.edu.au	56	100	265.326	346.817	416.200
	512	100	287.325	383.164	480.410
	1024	100	289.120	385.182	492.176
www.kyoto-u.ac.jp	56	100	81.010	92.076	100.242
	512	100	83.075	95.934	120.209
	1024	100	94.953	97.219	126.288

From the table above, we can see that the minimum RTT to the same hosts are different when using packets of different sizes. The general trend is that larger packets have a longer RTT. This is likely to be due to longer transmission delay.

Q4: Record the percentage of the packets sent that resulted in a successful response. What are some possible reasons why you may not have received a response? (Be sure to check the host in a web browser.)

0% of the packets sent resulted in a successful response (100% packet loss). Some possible reasons include:

- Security: The University of the Witwatersrand may have disabled ping responses for security reasons. (EG. to prevent people from sending very large packets to hosts and crash the system.)
- Congestion: The packets may be dropped due to a temporary congestion
- Misconfiguration: The network may be misconfigured

Q5: Explain how traceroute discovers a path to a remote host. (*Hint*: The traceroute manual will be helpful for answering this question.)

The traceroute command tracks the route an IP packet would follow to some internet host by launching probe packets with a small time to live (TTL) then listening for an ICMP "time exceeded" reply from a gateway. The probes are started with a TTL of one and increases by one until we get an ICMP "port unreachable" (or TCP reset), which means we got to the "host", or hit a max (which defaults to 30 hops).

Q6: Record the output of traceroute when run in both directions above.

New York:

Step	Time	Time	Time	Host name	IP address
1	1	<1	<1	72-9-99-137-cust-gw.reverse.ezzi.net	72.9.99.137
2	1	2	3	ads-psc-cr01.ezzi.net	96.45.77.1
3	1	<1	<1	ads-psc-ir01-v261.ezzi.net	72.9.111.109
4	2	1	1	ads-85t-ir01-vl2598-te6-4.ezzi.net	72.9.111.177
5	1	2	1	nyk-b5-link.telia.net	213.248.104.110
6	234	233	233	nyk-bb4-link.telia.net	80.91.254.15
7	68	68	69	sjo-b21-link.telia.net	62.115.119.229
8	233	233	233	snge-b1-link.telia.net	62.115.114.41
9	234	233	233	snge-b2-link.telia.net	62.115.135.175
10	234	234	234	starhub-ic-338377-snge-b2.c.telia.net	62.115.147.113
11	234	234	234		203.117.36.41
12	235	235	234		203.117.36.101
13	235	236	235		203.117.35.218
14	233	233	233		183.90.44.206
15	235	235	235		183.90.44.150
16	-	-	_		

Ashlyn Goh Cl02 1002840

Amsterdam:

Step	Time	Time	Time	Host name	IP address
1	1	<1	<1		213.214.121.210
2	1	1	<1		213.214.116.98
3	1	1	1		213.214.116.2
4	1	1	1	amsix-200gbps.core1.ams1.he.net	80.249.209.150
5	14	10	10	100ge9-2.core1.par2.he.net	184.105.81.109
6	22	29	20	100ge6-1.core1.mrs1.he.net	184.105.222.22
7	158	158	158	100ge10-1.core1.sin1.he.net	184.105.65.13
8	184	184	191	starhub-internet-exchange-as-ap-as38861.e0- 49.switch2.sin2.he.net	74.82.46.114
9	184	184	184		203.117.36.37
10	184	185	184		203.117.34.82
11	185	185	185		203.117.35.222
12	184	184	184		183.90.44.198
13	184	184	186		183.90.44.146
14	14	Ę,	-		

Tokyo:

Step	Time	Time	Time	Host name	IP address
1	<1	<1	<1	hosted-by.i3d.net	31.204.145.129
2	<1	<1	<1	6939.tyo.equinix.com	203.190.230.40
3	53	53	53	100ge10-2.core1.hkg1.he.net	184.105.64.129
4	84	83	84	starhub-internet-exchange-as-ap- as38861.10gigabitethernet7-20.core1.hkg1.he.net	74.82.46.82
5	87	87	87		203.116.188.77
6	84	84	84		203.117.36.101
7	85	85	85		203.117.35.218
8	83	84	83		183.90.44.206
9	84	84	84		183.90.44.150
10	-	-	-		
11	-	-	-		
12	-	-	_		
13	-	-	-		
14	-	-	-		

New York:

Amsterdam:

```
msterdam:
ceroute to 213.214.116.98 (213.214.116.98), 64 hops max, 52 byte packets
linksys99678 (192.168.1.1) 1.540 ms 1.480 ms 1.383 ms
182.55.228.3 (182.55.228.3) 4.179 ms 4.368 ms 1.83.90 ms
183.90.44.145 (183.90.44.145) 6.897 ms
183.90.44.149 (183.90.44.149) 3.839 ms
183.90.44.197 (183.90.44.149) 3.839 ms
183.90.44.197 (183.90.44.197) 4.621 ms
183.90.44.197 (183.90.44.197) 4.621 ms
183.90.44.197 (183.90.44.197) 4.621 ms
183.90.44.197 (183.90.44.197) 4.394 ms
203.117.35.221 (203.117.35.221) 4.188 ms
203.117.35.221 (203.117.35.221) 4.188 ms
203.117.35.221 (203.117.35.221) 4.187 ms
203.117.36.26 (203.117.34.81) 3.962 ms
203.117.36.8 (203.117.34.81) 3.962 ms
203.117.36.6 (203.117.36.6) 4.185 ms
203.117.36.6 (203.117.36.6) 4.185 ms
203.118.18.18.3 (203.116.188.38) 4.395 ms
203.118.18.18.133 (203.118.15.13) 4.793 ms
203.118.15.133 (203.118.15.13) 4.793 ms
203.118.15.133 (203.118.15.13) 4.793 ms
203.118.15.133 (203.118.15.13) 4.793 ms
203.118.15.133 (203.118.15.13) 4.961 ms
203.118.15.133 (203.118.15.13) 4.992 ms
203.118.15.133 (203.118.15.189.178) 3.943 ms 5.333 ms
203.118.15.137 (203.118.15.189.178) 3.943 ms 5.333 ms
203.118.15.137 (203.118.15.189.178) 3.943 ms 5.333 ms
203.118.15.137 (203.118.6.29) 4.318 ms
anutti13.starhub.net.sg (203.118.12.42) 5.686 ms 8.116 ms
ip4.glo.combell.com (80.249.210.149) 186.851 ms 187.388 ms 187.590 ms
213.214.116.52 (213.214.116.52) 187.640 ms 187.386 ms 186.595 ms
```

Tokyo:

```
Ckyo:

chellegoherhui@Michelles-MBP - $ traceroute 203.190.230.40
aceroute to 203.190.230.40 (203.190.230.40), 64 hops max, 52 byte packets
linksys09678 (192.168.1.1) 1.272 ms 1.031 ms 10.933 ms
182.55.28.3 (182.55.228.3) 14.462 ms 4.059 ms 4.783 ms
183.90.44.145 (183.90.44.145) 4.354 ms 4.168 ms
183.90.44.149 (183.90.44.149) 3.939 ms
183.90.44.199 (183.90.44.149) 3.939 ms
183.90.44.295 (183.90.44.205) 4.758 ms 3.733 ms 4.217 ms
203.117.35.105 (203.117.35.105) 3.983 ms
203.117.35.193 (203.117.35.193) 3.790 ms
203.117.35.217 (203.117.35.217) 4.432 ms
203.117.35.45 (203.117.36.6) 4.022 ms
203.117.34.85 (203.117.34.85) 4.130 ms 6.728 ms
dsts03.starhub.net.sg (203.118.12.66) 150.339 ms
ds-ts-04.starhub.net.sg (203.118.12.62) 196.071 ms 168.049 ms
203.118.15.206 (203.118.15.206) 4.584 ms
203.118.15.206 (203.118.15.206) 4.829 ms
***
```

Q7: 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?

The routers traversed in both directions are not the same. This might be due to routing being a two-way process; the best path from a client to the site might not be the best path from the site to the client. Routers are likely to choose the least cost link to forward the packets and the costs may not be the same in both directions. Hence, there exists an asymmetry which is likely to have led to the different routers traversed in both directions.