Computer Networking (COMP2322) Class Project Part Two

Rocky K. C. Chang

Please answer the two questions below for the second part of the project. The first question is written. The second question is based on the actual experimentation. Please assemble the IP network in Figure 2 and answer those questions with evidence from Wireshark captures. You may set up a Linux machine for the router.

(On paper) Consider an IP network in Figure 1 in which two IP subnets (subnets 1 and 2) have been configured. In each host's routing table, there are two main routing entries: one to its own subnet and the other one to its default router. H1 uses 123.123.2.10 for its default route, whereas H2 uses 123.123.1.10 for its default route.



Fig. 1. A network of two IP hosts and two IP routers.

- a) If H1 sends an IP packet to H2, how is the packet forwarded to the destination?
- b) If H1 sends an IP broadcast packet to its own IP subnet using 123.123.2.255, will the packet be received by the IP layer of H2? Explain your answer.
- c) In (a), is there an ICMP redirect message sent out by a router? Explain your answer.
- 2) (On experiments) To verify the answers to question 2 of assignment 2, we configured the hosts H1 (Ibm_b3:f0:cf) and H2 (Ibm_16:8b:06) with different subnet addresses, and the hosts communicated with each other through router R (Tp-LinkT_c9:41:05), as depicted in Figure 2. Their configurations and forwarding tables were:
 - R (eth1.0): 123.123.1.10; (eth1.1): 123.123.2.10; MAC Addr: 00:21:27:C9:41:05
 - H1 (eth0): 123.123.2.1/24; gateway 123.123.2.10; MAC Addr: 00:11:25:B3:F0:CF
 - H2 (eth0): 123.123.1.1/24; gateway 123.123.1.10; MAC Addr: 00:11:25:16:8B:06.

| | Destination | Gateway | Net mask | Interface |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|
| H1's routing table: | 123.123.2.0 | 123.123.2.1 | 255.255.255.0 | eth0 |
| | 0.0.0.0 | 123.123.2.10 | 0.0.0.0 | eth0 |



Fig. 2. Router R connected to hosts H1 and H2 through a switch.

| | Destination Gateway | | Net mask | Interface |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|
| H2's routing table: | 123.123.1.0 | 123.123.1.1 | 255.255.255.0 | eth0 |
| | 0.0.0.0 | 123.123.1.10 | 0.0.0.0 | eth0 |
| <i>R</i> 's routing table: | Destination | Gateway | Net mask | Interface |
| | 123.123.2.0 | 123.123.2.10 | 255.255.255.0 | eth1 |
| | 123.123.1.0 | 123.123.1.10 | 255.255.255.0 | eth1 |

Moreover, their ARP caches were initially empty. Then H1 sent ping requests (ICMP echo requests) to H2. The following list records what actually happened.

- *H*1 broadcasted an ARP request for the MAC addr of 123.123.2.10.
- R replied the ARP request with its MAC addr (00:21:27:C9:41:05).
- H1 sent out a ping request to H2 (123.123.1.1).
- R received the ping request, sent an ICMP Redirect message to H1, and forwarded the ping request to H2.
- H2 replied the ping request by sending an ICMP echo reply to R. Similar to before, R sent an ICMP Redirect message to H2.
- H2 broadcasted an ARP request for the MAC address of 123.123.2.1, and H1 replied.
- H1 sent a second ping request to H2 via R, and ICMP Redirect messages were again issued by R to H1 and H2.
- Starting from the third ping request and on, H1 and H2 were able to exchange ping requests and replies directly, without going through R.

Figure 3 shows the Wireshark capture at H1 with the promiscuous mode off (i.e., captures only packets destined to H1 and sent by H1). Note that since this trace was captured at H1, it does not contain the communication between R and H2.

Given the information above, answer the questions below with succinct explanation.

- a) What is the destination MAC address in the frame of packet 3 in the Wireshark trace?
- b) What is the value in the "Gateway address" field in the ICMP Redirect message (i.e., packets 4 and

| - | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------|--|
| No. | - Time | Source | Destination | Protocol | Info |
| | 1 0.000000 | <pre>Ibm_b3:f0:cf</pre> | Broadcast | ARP | Who has 123.123.2.10? Tell 123.123.2.1 |
| | 2 0.000145 | Tp-LinkT_c9:41:05 | Ibm_b3:f0:cf | ARP | 123.123.2.10 is at 00:21:27:c9:41:05 |
| | 3 0.000156 | 123.123.2.1 | 123.123.1.1 | ICMP | Echo (ping) request |
| | 4 0.000314 | 123.123.2.10 | 123.123.2.1 | ICMP | Redirect (Redirect for host) |
| | 5 0.000585 | Tp-LinkT_c9:41:05 | Broadcast | ARP | Who has 123.123.1.1? Tell 123.123.1.10 |
| | 6 0.000940 | 123.123.1.1 | 123.123.2.1 | ICMP | Echo (ping) reply |
| | 7 0.001103 | Ibm_16:8b:06 | Broadcast | ARP | Who has 123.123.2.1? Tell 123.123.1.1 |
| | 8 0.001117 | Ibm_b3:f0:cf | Ibm_16:8b:06 | ARP | 123.123.2.1 is at 00:11:25:b3:f0:cf |
| | 9 0.993191 | 123.123.2.1 | 123.123.1.1 | ICMP | Echo (ping) request |
| | 10 0.993334 | 123.123.2.10 | 123.123.2.1 | ICMP | Redirect (Redirect for host) |
| | 11 0.993587 | 123.123.1.1 | 123.123.2.1 | ICMP | Echo (ping) reply |
| | 12 1.992194 | 123.123.2.1 | 123.123.1.1 | ICMP | Echo (ping) request |
| | 13 1.992443 | 123.123.1.1 | 123.123.2.1 | ICMP | Echo (ping) reply |
| | 14 2.994116 | 123.123.2.1 | 123.123.1.1 | ICMP | Echo (ping) request |
| | 15 2.994339 | 123.123.1.1 | 123.123.2.1 | ICMP | Echo (ping) reply |
| | | | | | |

Fig. 3. A partial Wireshark capture of the packets when H1 pings H2 at H1 with the promiscuous mode off.

10 in the Wireshark trace)?

- c) How many ICMP header(s) is (are) included in the IP packet that carries the ICMP Redirect message?
- d) The Wireshark at H1 could capture R's ARP requests for H2's MAC address but not the ARP reply. What is the reason for that?
- e) H1 could send ping requests directly to H2 without first sending out an ARP request for H2's MAC address. What is the reason for that?
- f) If we examine the Wireshark trace captured at R with the promiscuous mode off, which packets in Figure 3 that will *not* show up in the trace?
- g) If we examine the Wireshark trace captured at H2 with the promiscuous mode off, which packets in Figure 3 that will *not* show up in the trace?
- h) Are the ICMP headers of packets 3 and 12 in Figure 3 identical?
- i) If the router's two interfaces eth1.0 and eth1.1 are now configured with two separate physical interfaces each of which is connected directly to a host, will *R* still send the ICMP Redirect messages? Note that the routing tables remain the same.