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1 Introduction

The internet has revolutionised the way business around the world is handled and has ushered in a new age of information and learning. It has never been easier to share and consume images, videos and text and as time progresses computers evolve further into devices which rely upon high-speed internet access to provide almost all of their functionality. Outside of schools, personal education has been revolutionised by sites like Khan Academy\(^1\), which make it possible for anyone with an internet connection to “learn anything for free”.

Within schools, the increasing use of streaming video and interactive online learning tools pose particular problems not often seen in other settings. Classes can consist of many students, and multiple classes can run simultaneously, leading to potentially large numbers of users contending for bandwidth at any one time. In order to take full advantage of these new resources, schools will need very high-speed internet connectivity.

This document analyses three tools specified by the State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA) that are used to assess the current level of internet connectivity available within schools. It presents a detailed description of each tool, including its strengths and weaknesses followed by observations based on measured data, and finally, conclusions.

\(^1\) http://www.khanacademy.com
2 Terminology

Before describing the tools and their methodologies, several terms must first be explained. This section describes the various meanings of bandwidth, as well as latency and CDNs.

2.1 Bandwidth

When accessing resources on the internet the rate at which a user can download these resources is often called the bandwidth or speed of connection. Due to the fact that resources are downloaded from remote servers, often in different cities, states and countries, users will find that access speeds vary greatly from site to site. Access speeds to these remote servers are affected by a large number of factors. For example, when repeatedly accessing the same resources, users may find the speed varies diurnally in sympathy with the number of users sharing the connection to the site. These effects will often be due to users of a local network competing for access, and also along the networks shared with other users accessing the same resources. In some cases, when using remote wireless links, connection speeds can also be affected by the weather.

Bandwidth or speed can be defined in multiple ways, depending on the context in which it is used. For example, the capacity of a link is the maximum speed at which data can be transmitted across it, the available bandwidth (sometimes colloquially called the “goodput”) of a link is the amount of spare capacity during a certain period, and the bulk transfer capacity is the maximum speed obtainable by a single (TCP) connection to a server.

For our purposes, the available bandwidth of a link will usually be the most useful of these, as it the amount of capacity available for use at any given time, and will be an important limit on how many users can utilise the link. This will be the main metric used here and will be referred to as ‘speed’ throughout this document.

Bandwidth is measured in bits per second, written as bps, or more commonly megabits per second, written as Mbps. One megabit per second is usually considered to be 1,000,000 bits per second. In some cases, the alternative units of bytes per second or megabytes per second are used. These are written as Bps (note the capital ‘b’), or MBps respectively. To convert from MBps to Mbps, multiply by 8 – the number of bits in a byte.

2.2 Latency & Round-trip Time

The amount of time it takes a remote computer to respond to requests is known as its latency. The total time taken for a message to pass from a local computer to a remote server, and then back again is known as the round-trip time (or RTT, typically double the latency). Latency is important because it moderates the bulk transfer capacity of a connection, which means that servers which take a long time to respond will also have a lower connection speed. For this reason, some speed test software picks servers with a lower latency when performing tests.

Latency affects bulk transfer capacity because each connection only allows a certain amount of data to be in flight at any given time, and because the latency describes how long it takes for data to travel across the connection. This means that a connection with a high latency cannot transmit data as quickly as one with a low latency. This is often described using a measurement called the bandwidth-delay product\(^2\), which is a measurement of how much data can be travelling in a connection at any given time. This is calculated by multiplying the bandwidth with the round-trip

\(^2\)http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bandwidth-delay_product
time, hence the name. The fact that the RTT is used and not the latency is due to the fact that TCP requires data to be acknowledged by its receiver before more can be sent, which adds to the delay.

2.3 CDN

A CDN (content delivery network) is a system in which servers are distributed across multiple locations, and where each server can be used to deliver content to end users. When a user accesses a site hosted using a CDN, the user will connect via a close server. This is designed to ensure a high speed, low latency connection regardless of the relative locations of the user and the servers hosting the site.
3 Tools & Speed Testing Methodologies

When measuring the available bandwidth to a remote server it is important to consider what is actually being measured.

Connecting to a server involves communications from the device which is making the connection passing through the local network to which it is connected, and then across links between several other networks which form a path between the device and server. If any one of the links between or within these networks is slower than any other, the available bandwidth will be reduced; the measured speed will always be lowest available bandwidth on any individual link between the device and server. Many connections are also asymmetric, which means that the available download and upload speeds differ. In this case, advertised upload speeds are generally significantly lower than download speeds, as most web traffic is downloaded by users rather than uploaded.

When taking measurements using a device which is connected to a wireless network, it is important to realise that modern internet connections can be considerably faster than wireless networks, and that because of their use of a shared transmission medium (air), heavily used wireless networks can perform significantly worse than their theoretical optimum speeds. Moving devices away from wireless access points can also result in a loss of connection speed. In these cases a speed test which was run from a device connected to a wireless network may measure the speed of the wireless network rather than the internet connection.

In some cases, the device being used to perform the tests may not be fast enough to generate or consume enough data to saturate the available bandwidth; in this case, the measured speed will be limited by the device running the speed tests.

Finally, the speed testing tool itself may not be able to accurately measure speeds over (or under) certain thresholds which could cause measurements to be falsely deflated or elevated.

Netcraft examined three tools which are commonly used to assess the internet connection speed of US schools, in order to assess how they work as well as their similarities and differences.

The following section examines how the tools operate, as well as highlighting limitations and advantages.

The three tools assessed were:

- SpeedTest.net
- http://www.schoolspeedtest.org
- Smarter Balanced diagnostic tools

---

3 http://www.speedtest.net
4 http://www.schoolspeedtest.org/
5 http://air.tds.airast.org/student/Pages/LoginShell.aspx?section=sectionDiagnostics&c=SBAC_PT
3.1 SpeedTest.net

SpeedTest.net is among the best known speed measurement tools. It operates by picking one of over 1000 remote hosts, in order to minimize latency. By picking the server with the lowest latency (which can severely affect bulk transfer speeds – see section 2.2), SpeedTest.net aims to provide an accurate estimate of the maximum available bandwidth. All of these remote hosts are operated by third parties. The tool itself uses Adobe Flash and makes use of between two and four simultaneous connections. The results presented by SpeedTest.net include ping (round-trip time), download speed and upload speed.

SpeedTest.net maintains a comprehensive library of technical documentation at https://support.speedtest.net/home. This documentation describes how its test works in detail.

Before both the main download and upload tests, small-scale tests are carried out to approximate the available bandwidth. The results of these tests are then used to estimate how large the files and data used by the full tests should be. The download speed test works by downloading a series of images of random pixels over a period of approximately 10 seconds, using between two and four simultaneous connections to attempt to maximise the speed. Using multiple connections allows SpeedTest.net to download or upload more traffic than using a single connection allows. Most modern web browsers use between two and six connections to each visited site for the same reason. During the test process, the speed is measured about 30 times per second. This contrasts with the other tools, which do not take measurements during the testing processes. These measurements are then converted into a histogram, and the top 10% and bottom 30% of samples are discarded. Finally the remaining samples are averaged and the result is used as the total download speed. Discarding samples is designed to reduce the effects of performance issues which can cause fluctuations in speed, as well as the fact that the TCP protocol uses a technique called slow start\(^6\), which causes connections to start slowly, and increase in speed according to network conditions.

\(^6\) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slow-start
Figure 1 (below) shows a simulated histogram of the type of measurements which might be gathered by SpeedTest.net during testing. The areas highlighted in red cover the bottom 30% and top 10% of the measurements taken, which are discarded for the final result. Both the modified average (in green), and average of all measurements (in blue) are shown. This demonstrates that SpeedTest.net’s method of removing samples causes the measured values to be higher than they would be without the modifications.

![Figure 1: simulated bandwidth measurements showing the effect of truncating data on the average](image)

SpeedTest.net’s upload speed measurements are less well documented, but operate in a similar fashion to the download tests. The flash applet generates and sends random data to the test server using up to four connections (depending on the network speed). Measurements of speed are taken whilst the upload process is running, and then the top 50% of measurements are used to calculate the final speed.

While testing the tools, Netcraft observed that SpeedTest.net’s results tend to be higher than the other tools.

### 3.2 SchoolSpeedTest

SchoolSpeedTest is an [EducationSuperHighway](http://www.educationsuperhighway.org) project designed to survey the actual internet connection speed available to schools and classrooms across the US. It is hoped that the information gathered by schools running tests will help inform policy makers and demonstrate the need for improvements in education infrastructure.

The SchoolSpeedTest site contains a database of frequently asked questions, at: [http://www.schoolspeedtest.org/faq.html](http://www.schoolspeedtest.org/faq.html).

---

7 http://www.educationsuperhighway.org
SchoolSpeedTest is designed to run on computers within schools and requires no special plugins or software to run. However, it is likely that measured performance will be higher when using modern web browser software. On first loading the site, a variety of requests for commonly used websites are made to determine which (if any) are blocked. It also checks if the address being used to access the site is located within the United States, and will only function if it is. Finally, the site checks several different CDNs (see section 2.3 for definition) to determine which has the lowest latency, the fastest is then used during download speed tests. The CDNs used by this tool are AWS CloudFront, RackCDN, Limelight Networks and Google, all of which are well-known and commonly used by large numbers of websites.

SchoolSpeedTest employs two different download speed testing methodologies, the first of these work by downloading a series of images files from the selected CDN over a period of approximately 15 seconds, and recording both how long the transfers take and how large the images are in order to perform speed calculations.

The second method involves simultaneously download several images, and then calculating the aggregate download speed. This method often leads to a higher speed measurement than downloading images individually, and emulates the way web browsing software loads images and other resources when browsing.

Following these two tests, the system then picks maximum of either the highest of the series measurements, or the aggregated speed measurement and displays this to the user. All speed measurements are sent to SchoolSpeedTest’s systems.

SchoolSpeedTest’s upload tests make use of three different pre-generated payloads, which are uploaded to the server over a period of approximately 10 seconds. Rather than use one of several CDNs as in the download test, all uploads are made to Amazon’s CloudFront. The uploads are timed, and the fastest upload speed is calculated and displayed to the user. As with the download tests, the instantaneous speeds are not sampled during the test, but calculated at the end, using the total time taken to upload each set of data. All measurements are sent to SchoolSpeedTest’s systems.

SchoolSpeedTest’s upload speed measurements do not appear to make multiple simultaneous uploads, which could limit the maximum measurable upload speed.

This methodology differs from SpeedTest.net in that it picks from a list of average speeds, rather than averaging a (modified) list of samples. SchoolSpeedTest’s documentation explains that this is because it aims to measure the “actual capacity available for digital learning”. This was reflected in the results gathered by Netcraft, which were slightly lower on average than those produced by SpeedTest.net.

3.3 Smarter Balanced

The Smarter Balanced Diagnostics page picks between two different speed testing methodologies, favouring a Java applet when a functional Java plugin is available, and falling back on using JavaScript otherwise. The site does not operate when accessed using Internet Explorer.

After determining the available bandwidth, the Smarter Balanced Diagnostics page makes use of a user-supplied number of users, and one of two possible exam profiles to determine if the amount of bandwidth is sufficient. An exam profile contains information on the number of questions, average response times and bandwidth requirements for typical exams. This is done using a statistical model, which is one of the most sophisticated features of any of the tools tested by Netcraft. This model
and the selected parameters do not affect the speed measurements displayed by this tool, but are instead used to determine if the measured bandwidth is sufficient for the selected exam profile.

3.3.1 JavaScript

The JavaScript-based test methodology is intended as a fall-back mechanism for use on devices without Java. It downloads the same random image three times, and then calculates the speed by timing the download and then dividing by the image size. This provides the average download speed. The site then displays the average of these three measurements to the user.

Upload testing is carried out by generating approximately 1 MB of test data and uploading it to the server three times. These requests are timed and the measured times used to calculate bandwidth measurements. The average of these three measurements is used as the measured upload speed.

During testing, Netcraft found that this measurement method produces the least accurate results of all three tools, with a maximum measured download bandwidth of approximately 10 Mbps (although tests results taken approximately one week after the first set did not appear to have the same limitations). This is likely due to the fact that only limited measurements are carried out (the images are approximately 1 MB in size), and that the server hosting the Smarter Balanced site has a high latency (approximately 25 ms from New York, 100 ms from the United Kingdom). Some of the other tools make use of CDNs to minimize this issue.

3.3.2 Java

As with the other download tools, the Smarter Balanced Java based methodology makes use of image downloads to estimate download speed, starting with a small-scale test in which three small images are downloaded. The speed of these downloads is then used to determine which of several larger images will be used for the main test. The larger image is then downloaded three times, and the final speed result is calculated by averaging the speeds of the three downloads. As with SchoolSpeedTest’s methodology, measurements are calculated once each download is completed, rather than during the download process.

The Java applet uses up to two simultaneous connections in order to increase the range of measureable bandwidth. However, whilst Netcraft found that this methodology was more reliable than the JavaScript method, it was still only able to accurately measure bandwidths of around 20 Mbps during the first round of testing. This is likely to be sufficient for schools with lower-bandwidth internet connections, but inadequate for higher speed connections. This limitation was not present in results made approximately one week after the first measurements were taken, although measured values were still low from other locations.
4 Measurements

Netcraft made a large number of measurements to assess how the tools behave under differing conditions.

These included measurements from a Macintosh connected to a wired office network in the United Kingdom with a 100 Mbps (symmetric - i.e. same available upload and download bandwidth) leased line, a Windows 7 laptop connected to a heavily used 802.11g wireless network and an Ubuntu (virtual) machine hosted in a datacenter in New York. In each case, Netcraft recorded the results of 30 sequential runs of each tool in order to get an idea of how consistently they performed under potentially changing conditions.

4.1 Wireless Office Network

A boxplot of the download and upload speed results gathered from the wireless network is shown in Figure 2. This figure illustrates how the measurements taken using each tool differ, and are spread out. The line in the centre of each box shows the median, the sides of the box show the upper and lower quartile, and the ‘whiskers’ extend to 1.5 times the distance between the upper and lower quartiles.

![Boxplot of wireless network measurements](image)

**Figure 2: Measurements taken on a wireless network**

Comparing the medians in the figure, it is clear that SpeedTest.net has a tendency to produce higher results than the other tools, especially in upload tests. SchoolSpeedTest produces lower results than SpeedTest.net, with a much lower spread, and the Smarter Balanced tools both produce results which are much lower than the other tools report, in both upload and download tests. In this case, the maximum theoretical bandwidth is 54 Mbps, although the available bandwidth is lower, due to the contention with other users. Measurements taken on the other networks show similar trends,
although the difference between upload speed measurements in more pronounced in this case. This could be due to the network conditions occurring during the test, as available bandwidth can be affected by many factors.

4.2 New York Server

Results gathered on the Ubuntu machine in New York are shown in Figure 3. These results show broadly similar characteristics to those of Figure 2. Although in this case the Smarter Balanced – Java results are higher than in the other tests they are still substantially lower than those provided by the other tools.

![Figure 3: Measurements taken on an Ubuntu virtual machine in New York](image)

4.3 Wired Office Network

Figure 4 shows results gathered on the 100Mbps wired network. These were taken on a (2007 model) MacBook Pro laptop, using Chrome. Once again, similar trends are in evidence, however the measured upload speeds are all fairly low. This is likely to be due to network usage during the period the measurements were taken, demonstrating the need to take measurements at multiple times in order to get an accurate picture of network speeds, especially on high speed networks where computers may not be able to generate or consume sufficient amounts of data to accurately measure the available capacity.
Figure 4: Measurements taken on a wired network with a 100 Mbit/s internet connection.

To further investigate the differences between the speed testing tools and their results, Netcraft artificially limited the available upload bandwidth on an Ubuntu virtual machine hosted in New York. The results, (which are shown in Figure 5) clearly illustrate the tools’ differing behaviour.

Figure 5: Measured upload speeds with capped availability
Both SpeedTest.net and SchoolSpeedTest returned measurements which are slightly lower than the actual available speed. However, both of the Smarter Balanced tools returned results which stop rising at much lower values (approximately 8 Mbps and 20 Mbps for Smarter Balanced – JavaScript and Smarter Balanced – Java respectively), suggesting that they are currently only able to adequately measure low speeds.

Netcraft reran the same test approximately one week after the first, and found that the results from the Smarter Balanced Java tool were significantly different. These changes coincided with a marked increase in the accuracy of results from Smarter Balanced Diagnostics page with the greatest improvements observed on the Ubuntu server in New York. The newest results are shown in Figure 6. Netcraft was unable to replicate the large speed increase from outside of the US (New York), although small speed increases were observed. These changes did not coincide with any changes to the Java applet used by the Smarter Balanced site, which suggests that the Smarter Balanced server may have markedly improved in performance within the United States, but that high latency to other areas is still lowering the available bandwidth to the server.

![Figure 6: Measured upload speeds with capped availability (taken approximately one week after the initial measurements).](image-url)
## 5 Summary of Tools

The following tables summarises the main similarities and differences between the speed testing tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>SpeedTest.net</th>
<th>SchoolSpeedTest</th>
<th>Smarter Balanced – Java</th>
<th>Smarter Balanced -- JavaScript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses CDN/close server?</strong></td>
<td>✓ - picks among many possible servers</td>
<td>✓ - CloudFront, RackCDN, Limelight Networks and Google</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple measurements or several tests</strong></td>
<td>Multiple measurements</td>
<td>Several tests</td>
<td>Several tests</td>
<td>Several tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complex data processing?</strong></td>
<td>✓ – conditions data by removing measurements</td>
<td>✓ – uses averages</td>
<td>✓ – uses averages</td>
<td>x – uses averages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Multiple simultaneous downloads, with multiple measurements during the download process. Followed by removing the bottom 30% and top 10% of measurements and averaging the remaining samples. Similar upload process with bottom 50% discarded.</td>
<td>Multiple downloads in series and simultaneously from the best CDN, then averages are calculated and the highest used. Upload speed tests all use CloudFront. All gathered data is used to improve SchoolSpeedTest’s database.</td>
<td>Designed as a fall-back for Smarter Balanced – Java. Downloads an image several times then calculates average speed. Upload tests operate in a similar fashion.</td>
<td>Downloads several images simultaneously from the Smarter Balanced server and calculates average transfer speed. The same images are then used in upload tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requires browser plugins?</strong></td>
<td>Adobe Flash</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimates</strong></td>
<td>Maximum connection speed</td>
<td>Usable network capacity</td>
<td>Exam suitability &amp; usable network capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses multiple connections to measure high bandwidths?</strong></td>
<td>✓ - 2 – 4</td>
<td>✓ - Up to 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓ - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Conclusions

Both SpeedTest.net and SchoolSpeedTest make excellent choices for examining network speed because of their use of close servers and CDNs to ensure accurate measurements regardless of physical location. SpeedTest.net is a good fit for technical support and evaluating the raw speed of newly installed internet connections, as its vast network of servers means the likelihood of obtaining a realistic estimate of the connection’s available bandwidth is high. Also the results produced by the tool are designed to be slightly higher than other tools. SchoolSpeedTest is suitable for evaluating existing networks for information on useable speed, as it simulates actual browsing by making use of a content delivery network and measuring average available bandwidth, without discarding low results. It has the added advantage that results gathered be to help determine future education policies. Finally, results produced by the Smarter Balanced tools are generally less consistent than those produced by the other tools. However, in Netcraft’s later tests (see Figure 6) the Java based tests performed well. This suggests that the Smarter Balanced diagnostic tools may be useful for testing devices on which an up to date Java plugin is available.

When testing, it is important to remember that it is only possible to measure the speed of the slowest link in the path between the measuring device and remote server, and that measured results will vary according to many different factors, including the number of users, time of day and server performance. For these reasons, it is necessary to take multiple measurements using different devices and networks.
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