

Mission is Possible Presidential Transition Mini-Series

Episode 3: Lindsay Rodman: Cracking Open the Process to Enhance Diversity

SASHA: Welcome back to Mission is Possible. I am Sasha O'Connell and I am thrilled to be introducing this miniseries of the Mission is Possible podcast, a joint project between Guidehouse and American University. This spin off series dives into the world of Presidential transitions and explores what can be expected inside the agencies during this timeframe and how best to prepare for success by talking with the folks who have been there. Thank you for tuning in, and please enjoy.

INTRODUCTION: Prior to the election, I sat down with the Executive Director of LCWins, Lindsay Rodman. Lindsay served in the Marine Corps for eight years on active duty. She has served as the Deputy Legal Counsel to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and as a White House Fellow on the National Security Council. Lindsay has various experience in the realm of National Security and on this episode, we discuss her background as well as the groundbreaking work she is doing on diversity in the National Security sector at LCWins.

SASHA: We're so excited to have Lindsay Rodman with us this morning, a little bit different from our previous speakers on the podcast. Lindsay does come from an incredible federal service career and she's also running a really interesting organization now that has particular relevance to presidential transitions. And that is the Leadership Council for Women in National Security or LCWINS. We are thrilled Lindsay to have you with us today on the podcast and we're super excited to hear more about both your career and the work of LCWINS. So welcome.

LINDSAY: Thank you so much for having me. I'm really thrilled to be here.

SASHA: Awesome, well if we can start, I know you said this is the least interesting part, but I think you have an absolutely fascinating federal career, DOD, you've spent some time in National Security Council, can you just kind of skim your resume for us a little bit so we understand your perspective and get a little bit of appreciation for your service and where you've been in the government.

LINDSAY: Yeah. Sure. So I started, I did undergrad, I went straight through to graduate school and law school, which you're not supposed to do, but I did. Then on the back end, I went to the Law Firm of Arnold and Porter for one year and then left that to join the Marine Corps. When people see my resume they think, "Oh was being a first year associate so terrible that you had to run away and join the Marine Corps." No, that is not the story. Arnold and Porter was very gracious.

It was more an issue with the training pipeline and the Marine Corps and how long it would take for me to be able to actually come in and start. I served in the Marine Corps on active duty for eight years. I had a pretty great career. I absolutely loved it.

The first half was kind of normal by Marine Corps standards. I did my training in Quantico, I served in Okinawa, I served in Afghanistan. And the second half was not normal by Marine Corps standards for someone of my rank, because I actually spent it in the Pentagon and in the White House. So as you

mentioned in my last year on active duty, in my eighth year, I served on the National Security Council staff. I was selected as a White House Fellow, which was an incredible opportunity. And from there, I transitioned into a political appointment as a Special Assistant to the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness at the Department of Defense. And then moved over to be a Senior Advisor in the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Stability and Humanitarian Affairs. I was in Personnel and Readiness and then in policy. And then for family reasons I moved to Canada.

I transitioned out of the administration in September of 2016. That had nothing to do with the election or pending election decisions or anything like that. It just was my husband's career that took us to Canada for a couple years. I had a kid while we were in Canada and I did some Think Tank work including a fellowship with the Council in Foreign Relations. And then we moved back to New York City where I am now and once again it was my husband's career that brought us here, but this is also my hometown, so I wanted to come home for a little bit and see what it would be like.

I worked for Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America as Executive Vice President and then moved over when the job posting at LCWINS came up to be Executive Director at LCWINS, which was just a really amazing opportunity to blend my experience in the National Security world, my passion for elevating women in service and in the National Security sphere in general, and my sort of new career in managing non-profits, which is a skill set that I was real interested in developing personally as well.

SASHA: Amazing. Thank you for your service and what an incredible kind of career. I always tell our students at American University (AU), I talk about sort of the world of opportunity that can open and the diversity of experiences that you can have and you're certainly a testament to that. So exciting. Well let's turn to LCWINS, which I'm passionate about as well, as you know. Can you for our listeners, start at the beginning. What is LCWINS? What was the impetus for creating it? And what's the mission today?

LINDSAY: LCWINS was founded in the Summer of 2019 by a group of women who had been meeting informally and kind of socially to support each other and they realized that a more formal form of that kind of support was necessary at this stage of their careers. There are a lot of organizations that do fantastic support for women early to mid-career and women who are students, they are all organizations that we partner with and try to lift up in our work because the role of LCWINS was never to move into that space. It was really to fill a gap that these women perceived at the senior levels. And this notion that for a long time we've heard, "Well if you just fix the pipeline, you'll see leadership at the top naturally change as well."

And it's been 20 years at least since many of these organizations have been around and we do see great numbers of women, we are basically 50/50 in terms of the entry level, who's coming into service, and yet the top really doesn't look substantially different. The idea behind LCWINS was let's form a small organization, the idea was never to take over the world, but just to take over our tiny little niche chunk of

the world, and really change what leadership looks like. Our mission is really about gender diversity and improving national security by ensuring gender parity or diverse teams in terms of gender at the top. And I also want to note that there is a deep seeded recognition among the founders and the women and the men who are a part of the organization that gender diversity cannot come at the cost of other forms of diversity. There's a strong history of frankly, white women being elevated at the expense of other groups and that being championed as diversity. We're not going to do that.

That is LCWINS in terms of its founding, and then if I can kind of go into where they took it from there. So the first thing they did which was very inspired and quite clever and pre-dates me coming on board, was to obtain from as many presidential candidates as possible in 2019, a commitment that they would strive for gender diversity in national security. This was back when there were dozens of presidential candidates and now we're down to two. So they got 18 presidential candidates, including one Republican presidential candidate, so it was a bi-partisan effort and we are 501(c)(3), so everything we do is strictly non-partisan and therefore at the very least bi-partisan. They got these 18 presidential candidates to make this commitment and Joe Biden and Kamala Harris as presidential candidates both made the commitment. The Trump Team has not made the commitment, but we continue to reach out in parallel as I said, everything we do has Republican and Democratic component to it. We've had some nice feedback from folks associated with the Trump side, so although they haven't made this commitment, we still are trying to work in parallel to achieve gender parity in the national security sphere.

And then when I came on board over the winter as employee number one, in this little start-up organization my role was sort of to think through, "Okay, we've got this commitment, how do we implement it? What can we as an external organization do to increase the chances of achieving gender parity in the next administration?" And as I started doing some research and talking to folks, we identified three things that we could do just right off the bat. First, is in best practices, just thinking through the political appointments process, and if there're small tweaks in terms of intentionality that we could make early on to ensure that this is front of mind. And those are posted on our website, you can go to [LCWINS.org/initiatives](https://www.lcwins.org/initiatives) to see that.

The next was to compile a database of women who are well-qualified and ready to serve in the most senior national security positions. And the thought there was that historically folks have said, "Oh of course, of course I want gender parity, but we couldn't quite find the women. Or they're not ready. Or they're not readily available. This is important to me, and we'll do it next time." And this is something that women feel like they've heard just routinely throughout their careers. So, we figured we'd try to make it easy for them and give them ample numbers of names.

And we looked at all the rules and there are about 200 Senate confirmed national security political appointments. We started there, because we are a very small organization and just figured, this is the world that we can sort of wrap our arms around. And so with 200 positions, I was pretty adamant that we probably needed at least 500 women because you want to have multiple women for a position, you want ample choice, you don't want to give them the excuse that they weren't the right women. And that was daunting for a small organization to go out and find 500 well-qualified women that are ready to come in on Day 1.

Ultimately the database that we compiled that we closed in September had 850 women, a little over 850 women. We were pretty thrilled about that. For folks that are curious, we are going to refresh that initiative around the inauguration time because if anyone else's COVID pandemic has been like mine, asking me in August or September if I know what I want in January, February, I wouldn't know.

But for now both the Biden and Trump folks have received the folks from our database and they've confirmed receipt and been really appreciative actually for the effort, which is great.

And the last thing that we did, and I apologize for talking for so long, but-

SASHA: No, it's wonderful.

LINDSAY: The last thing that we did was put together a series of webinars and those are available on our website at [LCWINS.org/webinars](https://www.lcwins.org/webinars) about the political appointments process. The idea was to de-mystify the process and democratize access to this information because I, at least, became convinced as we started doing the research and understanding more about political appointments, that it's really the opacity of the process, the fact that people don't understand how to engage with it, that is perpetuating a lack of diversity because if you are well-qualified, but you don't know the right person because you're not in that old boys network, then you may not actually be able to rise to consideration and ultimately achieve that leadership position despite being well-qualified. Let me stop there, but that is sort of what we've done recently and what we're focused on in terms of getting women into these leadership positions and I'm very optimistic.

SASHA: That's amazing. So I get the opportunity on behalf of our audience to ask a follow-up. I think one of the things that's so interesting in what you said, right, which is it's not really a supply problem, right? There's sort of a demand side hurdles problem, and you talked about when you got into this sort of learning about how this opaqueness is a mystery around the process maybe is part of that problem from a pulling in versus people being available.

Can you talk more about what that is? I know I've sat in on some of your webinars, they were amazing about some of the pieces. What are the pieces that are not well understood that can be daunting or just a mystery and has any of that changed; how do you see COVID playing into all that? Is that making it worse or better? What have you learned through this whole process of getting engaged with that side of it?

LINDSAY: I do also recognize that there are some things that impact women on the whole differently than men. And one of the things about the political appointments process is that it's important to let people know your interest. So not necessarily being solicitous of positions, which women typically shy away from, again not everyone, but overall, I think we do that less than men do. But to stick your neck out and find

the people who might be well-positioned to champion you for those roles and actually say, "I would like to serve and I would like for you to help me get there." That's really tough. I think that women in general, people in general, but women in particular would prefer to be excellent, to wait for somebody to notice and then to just elevate you without you making them do it for you, right?

SASHA: Absolutely.

LINDSAY: I would prefer a world that works like that.

SASHA: Absolutely.

LINDSAY: For everyone, but that's not how the political appointments process works, they're not going to discover you without you taking proactive steps to get engaged with the process. So that has been, I think my biggest overarching learning point and the one that I think has a particularly gendered component to it. So that's been the one that I've been hammering home.

It's interesting that you ask about COVID as well. Over the summer we started hearing inklings, very anecdotal, that right at the time that we are working so hard to create enhanced opportunities for women to serve in leadership that women are actually leaning out of the workforce in historic numbers. At least for the times, because of COVID. And this is something that I'm actually hoping to lend some time to. We have a fantastic fall fellow who's helping me with this, and another Kennedy School student who's helping as well, trying to do just a little bit of research and doing some listening sessions with folks trying to understand, one, whether that's actually the case, whether those numbers that we're seeing reported in the media are actually impacting women who might be interested in national security leadership positions. Maybe we're sort of a niche group that isn't affected in the same way.

And then if we are affected in a certain way, which I anticipate we probably are, are there any policy levers or other kinds of approaches that an incoming administration might think to at least address those concerns, encourage women regardless, to think through support, think through enhanced flexibility, think through advanced technological solutions. We're at the beginning of the stages of exploring this question, but I do have a concern that COVID may actually impact this effort in a negative way, as it has with so many other things. And we're trying to problem solve on that front.

SASHA: It's so interesting, right? This idea of the life balances changing for work, for women disproportionately makes a lot of sense. I wonder, in your experience, has networking gotten harder? So you talk about this kind of hurdle for women of sort of putting yourself out there, and I mean for me I can

say, just in other context for school or otherwise, it's one thing to ask someone for coffee right, or to drop by someone's office. It's another thing to set up a Zoom or like, how do you even do that? Have you found that too, to be kind of an interesting you know, sort of challenge for folks? If you try to encourage folks to get engaged and kind of lean in, how does that communication piece play out?

LINDSAY: I mean there's so many things that are awful about this pandemic, but I think folks at least I feel, and I've heard from other folks as well, the people that you knew in March, are kind of like, it's the same group of people now. There haven't been those sort of opportunities to bump up against different people.

LINDSAY: And so right when we're sending people, you know, information and putting on webinars about how you need to expand your networks and how you need to figure out ways to bump, like up against people who might be in a position to champion you for these jobs, those opportunities are lesser. That being said, I do think that because you're not going to just serendipitously bump up against the former Under Secretary and the hiring manager for the job that you really want, it's almost like that swift kick in the butt that people need to just ask. Right? Like just reach out and do it.

And during one of our webinars, Shelly Stoneman who was the White House liaison in the Department of Defense, amazing person, she's on the Executive Committee of LCWINS, her advice was people don't really have time for coffees these days, and if you do have a direct question now is a time when it's become more socially acceptable just to ask the direct question directly. Like, right? You don't have to take an hour out of somebody's day and like, pretend to have a coffee over Zoom or whatever, it doesn't even work. So if you have a question, just ask it.

In some ways I wonder if thinking about things from that perspective might help people feel a little bit more encouraged to just go for it. If it's a question of building relationships or asking certain questions, maybe that counsels a little bit more in favor of, if you have a question, don't feel shy about asking it. But I do think it's hard to build new relationships during this time frame, and that's so much a part of how you move your career forward, especially when it comes to this political appointments question. It's tough.

SASHA: Absolutely. No, it's great advice. So we talked a little bit, you mentioned briefly the webinars, I've sat in on some that were amazing and I know they're taped and available on your website, can you just kind of go through what topics you've covered again? I think it's such an interesting selection of things to help folks, what's out there from an education perspective and again, it's speaks to what you guys have identified as maybe some of those challenge points, things that are a little hidden.

LINDSAY: Yeah. So, we did six webinars. The first one was a High-Level Perspective. We had women who've really served at the absolute pinnacle type jobs give a little bit of an overarching reflection on how they got there. We thought that might be nice just to contextualize the rest of the conversation.

Then we moved on to the webinar that I would say, is the one that I think is an absolute requirement that you need to go to first is our webinar number two, which is Political Appointments 101, where they actually go through how you get politically appointed. Who's making those decisions, who do you need to talk to, what the process looks like from there. How the vetting happens and the timeline. They don't focus as much on the vetting forms, and security clearances, what Senate confirmation looks like, that all comes in later webinars, but it is just the overarching process one and the rest of the webinars do focus on those other questions.

So our third one was on ambassadors, the fourth one was on the security clearances and vetting. We actually didn't record that one, but the Partnership for Public Service has three excellent webinars that cover all of that, so the notes from that one are on our website, the attorneys in the session didn't want it to be recorded and we thought that the questions might be more forthright if we didn't record it, but the notes are available, and then the fifth one was on Senate confirmation and then the sixth one, again not recorded and we'll put notes up for that one as well, was on race and intersectionality.

That's our webinars. They were great. I recommend them to anyone who's interested, and as I said, we're going to continue to put notes up there and resources for folks who have follow-up questions and I also do recommend to folks the Ready to Serve Partnership for Public Service webinars for folks who have specific questions about security clearances and vetting and ethics because those people get really in the weeds with their follow-up questions like, "But what if I'm a dual citizen and my husband has property in another country and blah, blah, blah."

SASHA: Right

LINDSAY: And it's like all of those are some answerable questions, you can certainly get those answers, but if no one's even considering you to be hired, then those are not questions to look at.

SASHA: Start at the beginning. Absolutely that makes sense. Having had this opportunity to really dig in, in this space, and again, sort of think about that demand side, right? How it works and pulling folks in. What, and I'm sure this is interesting for our audience, who work in the National Security Sector now, what was most surprising to you when you really learned more about how it all works, and got to work with folks who've been through the process? What were maybe some of your biggest surprises to learn about how some of this stuff goes down?

LINDSAY: I had been a political appointee before and I'm super open about this. I actually, not only had I been a political appointee, I had a higher position that I was being vetted for at the White House that fell through for reasons that were completely outside of my control. I've been on both sides. I've been on the gaining side and on the losing side. I thought I had some sense of the process and the decision points and who the players were, and I realized that I really didn't. The more I learned about who was talking to who about what and what other considerations are at stake and all the musical chairs that are going on behind the scenes that people are concerned about, they were not front of mind for me. I was just like, "I want this job."

"It's not complicated, just give it to me." Right? And that's not how it works, surprisingly. So that was one big surprise. Another big surprise, which was sort of an ah-ha moment I had a couple months ago, when I was talking to a Masters class at George Washington University and the professor was asking me about, what are the policy levers and what kind of constraints are there on the political appointments process? What are you up against, essentially in terms of achieving gender parity?

SASHA: Yeah.

LINDSAY: And I thought about it, and I thought there aren't. There's absolutely no reason that this cannot be achieved on Day 1.

SASHA: So interesting.

LINDSAY: So that was sort of unsatisfying because they're policy students, you want to give them something to chew on.

SASHA: Right.

LINDSAY: And so she asked a couple of follow-up questions and as we're talking about it, the answers, there are none. In truth, the next administration, whether it's a second Trump Administration or a first Biden administration, gets to decide who serves in each of these positions. They need to pass through Senate confirmation. So, you can't presume confirmation, but for the most part, anyone who's reasonably qualified is going to get through. And we have a database that shows that there are hundreds and hundreds of women who are well-qualified for all of these jobs. So there is literally no impediment other than will. Other than creating the political will internal to either the transition team or presidential

personnel, and then external right? Folks like us talking about it and creating a presumption and frankly an expectation that they will make good on their word.

SASHA: It's so interesting. So, there may be reasons, but there're no good reasons, right? I mean, that's sort of what you're saying.

LINDSAY: I mean, the reasons are the reasons that I don't think pass muster anymore, like we owed too many political favors to white men. I don't find that compelling.

SASHA: Exactly. And to your point, there's no actual levers, right? That's amazing.

LINDSAY: Yeah. So for folks who are listening to this podcast who are civil servants, who are used to USA jobs and federal hiring process, I mean there you have real structural constraints on how you take in potential applicants and what the interview process looks like, and how you go through the decision making process. There's none of that infrastructure about political appointees, so you really get to shape your pool the way that you want to consider them in the way that you want to and ultimately end up with the leadership that you want.

SASHA: So exciting. It's really exciting that the future is bright. Right? In terms of limitless, in terms of making this happen. That's so great. Before we let you go, I guess my last question would be to you, what advice, I mean we've talked about a number of things in terms of leaning in, in terms of making connections and being assertive to yourself, and not waiting for someone to find you, but for our audience generally, whether they're folks who are considering, would like to be considered for a political appointment or maybe even folks who will end up with new political office, maybe you've never come into national security sector before, based on your experience as a political and all your work in LCWINS, what's your summary advice to folks thinking about this really incredibly dynamic time that is a transition again, whether it's to a second term or to a new administration?

LINDSAY: Yeah. So for folks who are interested in political appointment, the one thing that we haven't really touched on, that seems obvious, but you need to drill down on it, is political appointments are for frankly, political people. There're a lot of people in the national security world, including me when I was in the Marine Corps, who are really proud of their a-political bent.

And that is an important thing, so for the intelligence professionals out there, for the folks who are still in the military, even for the civil servants, that is commendable and incredibly important. And they are the subject matter experts, but the political appointments process is not about elevating them to the next tier. It's not just the next promotion, it's about a political extension of the President and the President's policy priorities for the administration. If you are someone who's in government but maybe seeking to make that transition, understanding that there's a reason that people come from the campaign for these jobs. Because they are the people who are most intimately familiar with the policy priorities of the campaign and they are the political extension of the President. I'm not endorsing our system; I'm not saying that it should or should not be this way. It just is the system. I think that can be really tough as someone who has worked sort of through the DOD bureaucracy on the inside and then come in as a political.

I have a deep appreciation and see great value in the subject matter expertise and the people who are in the organization and I also, from my time in the Pentagon as a Marine, saw political appointees come and go, and it does create some friction for the folks in the building. In particular, I think some of the hardest times, were actually when we didn't have appointees, because you're doing all this work, and then you're sending it up for decision, and then the decision is going to determine where we go from here and what future work looks like, and at least at times where we were you know, transitioning leadership, even not a presidential transition, but one appointee was gone and we're waiting for the next one, it was often really hard to get stuff done. So, I do imagine that there's going to be some of that friction for folks in the building with a transition.

Where somebody new is coming in, of course there's the classic stories about the new person comes in and wants to create a new org chart. There's also just going to be the time where it takes for you to be elevating the work that you've been doing, and then getting that feedback on like, is this going to work or not work with the policy priorities of this new administration or if it's a Trump continuation. I know there are a lot of political appointments that are currently open and the hope is that maybe they'll put some more bodies in seats so that you can actually get some political decisions on these questions. Because that's really how things move. So, for the folks who are in the building and continue to be the subject matter experts and the folks who really make things work, I would say stick with it. Transition is a period of transition, but hopefully we'll get kind of a steady state once we get more bodies in seats either in a second Trump Administration or in a first Biden Administration.

SASHA: That's super helpful. And I know I said that was the last question, but one follow-up because that was such a great answer.

Because you have been on both sides of this right, so it's such a great perspective, but some of the other folks that you talked to have counseled patience to your point. Right? That these first couple weeks or even first couple months and hundred days and how it goes, we sort of joke about the re-naming, or the re-orging, but some of the advice has been to come to that if you are a career person with an open mind, right? That some of that sort of shakes out, and that in fact maybe overall goals aren't as far apart, right, as they may seem.

At first, there's just sort of this shaking out period. Would you agree with that? Do you have any more insights into that? 'Cause I have been in that situation too, obviously the FBI's a little different, just one

political at the top, but as things kind of shake out through DOJ, what do you think about that in terms of that initial cut of being hit with new priorities the re-naming, the re-org's? What your advice during that period?

LINDSAY: Yeah. And if we're going to be really frank about the conversations that happen inside the building, it's not just that, it's that you've got some outsider, who comes in with hopefully credentials in this space. And quite often they do have great credentials in the space, but their career hasn't looked like what the careers look like in the building. And you come to think about, this is the right way to grow a leader and not think about the value of that external thought and that external perspective.

SASHA: Perspective. Absolutely.

LINDSAY: So I mean, I've been trying to think this through now from the outside. When we try to diversify who political appointees are, we have to think even less in terms of a cookie cutter of who the right political appointee should be. So the right political appointee can't be a Department of Defense, a military veteran who's now the CEO of a Fortune 500 Company, who has continued to engage in the defense industry. It could be that person, but then you know, the number of women who are able to serve in those roles is very small. But there are so many incredibly inspiring and competent leaders in the national security space who are at NGO's right now, or in academia and who really do have qualifying experience in the field, but if they come in as the next Assistant Secretary for whatever, as with pretty much any political appointee, they're not going to come in with all of the requisite knowledge for how the building works and how it should work. There is going to be that learning point and that friction. Not just because they want to come in and change everything, but just because they're coming in with an outside perspective. The advice is to try and value that outsider's perspective. And think about like, if you got to pick the brain of an academic for a day about how your organization works, and how it could work better, you'd probably get a lot out of it and that's precisely what they're trying to do in that position.

They are a political extension of the Presidency, but they're also a leader who's well-experienced, but coming in from the outside to provide a new perspective and hopefully actually improve things with that critical lens. So trying to embrace that and think of that as being constructive and helpful in the way that like a teacher, professor would come help you through tackling a tough problem, might be helpful on your more frustrating days. Otherwise, go home and figure out the right way to relax. Crack a beer, whatever the right way to enjoy the transition and know that as they get into the swing of things, you'll start establishing new patterns and I think it will be fine. And I don't think it's all bad. I mean sometimes, we have great and fantastic leaders come in on Day 1 and hit the ground running and there are no issues.

SASHA: Yeah. No, that's great. Thank you so much. The point about not just keeping an open mind about sort of language, we've talked about, right? Branding, and language and even re-org, but even who

the people are right, and again that maybe they're coming from a different kind of expertise than is traditionally kind of valued and moved up in your organization is a great addition. So, thanks for that. Well Lindsay Rodman it has been awesome to talk to you. It has been so much fun. Thank you so much again for your service and for the work you're doing with LCWINS. Again, for our listeners, can you just give us again the information on your website and anything else upcoming that folks should know.

LINDSAY: Yes. Absolutely. So, [LCWINS.org](https://www.lcwins.org) is where everything is contained. If you go to [LCWINS.org/database](https://www.lcwins.org/database) you can learn more about our database initiative. [LCWINS.org/webinars](https://www.lcwins.org/webinars) is where all of our webinars are posted. And [LCWINS.org/initiatives](https://www.lcwins.org/initiatives) is where we've got our best practices recommendations, a pledge that's comparable to the pledge that we ask presidential candidates to take that people can take and sort of sign on themselves to be a part of the effort. And there's tons more information there including your ability to join our mailing list, so I really do recommend the website to folks, and reach out with any questions. We're standing by to help anyone who's interested really, of course, in particular women and women of color, but really trying to cast a broad net and help anyone who feels like they don't understand how to get forward in this process to try and get that leg up.

SASHA: Amazing. Thanks again for everything and thanks for joining us.

LINDSAY: Sure. Thanks so much for having me.

SASHA: Thank you so much for tuning in to this episode of the Mission is Possible Presidential Transition miniseries. If you are interested in hearing more, look out for new episodes in this special series, and check out our other episodes on Apple Podcasts, TuneIn, Stitcher, or on the Guidehouse website.