Lex Fridman

From behavioral biometrics and martial-arts interviews to a global conversation programme

Lex Fridman is a computer scientist who became the host of a widely followed long-form interview programme. [35] Trained at Drexel University and subsequently employed in MIT’s research world, he first worked on recognizing people through their behavior and on the interaction between drivers and automated cars. [3]

Alongside that career, he interviewed martial artists; in 2018 he began the artificial-intelligence conversations that developed into the Lex Fridman Podcast. Its guests now range from mathematicians and programmers to artists, technology executives and heads of government. [1]

An early glimpse of the interviewer appears in an unexpected place: the preamble to his own 2017 appearance on Software Engineering Daily. Before discussing autonomous vehicles, Fridman asks how the remote-recording software works and learns why the host keeps a backup. He explains that he has interviewed Olympic athletes, but prefers being in the room: questions about fear and difficult periods in a life are easier when he can look someone in the eye. The desire for an unusually direct encounter was already there, before the famous guests, the large audience or the suit became shorthand for a media personality. [5]

1. From the Soviet Union to Drexel

Fridman was born in Soviet Tajikistan and grew up partly in Russia before his family moved to the United States. The move brought them to the Chicago suburbs and later Philadelphia, where his father became a plasma-science professor at Drexel. In her 2025 profile, Maddy Crowell traces the migration through Fridman’s public recollections: he remembered going from a socially comfortable childhood to feeling like an outsider in America. Philadelphia brought his own higher education into the same university environment as his father’s research. [2]

At Drexel, he completed a combined computer-science bachelor’s and master’s degree in 2010 and an electrical-and-computer-engineering doctorate in 2014. Two advisers gave him different kinds of help. Steven Weber encouraged exploratory curiosity; Moshe Kam concentrated on turning an overabundance of ideas into questions that could be formulated and tested. Kam’s account of advising him is unusually practical: the work was partly selection, preserving the unused ideas for later rather than pretending every promising thought could become the current experiment. Fridman would remain grateful for both kinds of instruction. [3]

His dissertation, Learning of Identity from Behavioral Biometrics for Active Authentication, addressed a specific security problem. A password identifies someone at login; what if the person using the device changes afterward? Fridman combined evidence from typing, mouse movement, application use, browsing, location and writing style. Separate classifiers made judgments that a decision-fusion system combined. Tests used datasets of 67 desktop users and 200 mobile-device users, measuring both identification performance and how quickly an intruder could be detected. This was the work behind the broad public label “AI researcher”: designing and evaluating systems that inferred identity from ordinary interaction with a machine. [4]

He then spent about six months at Google continuing authentication work before moving to MIT, attracted, he told Drexel’s interviewer, by the more unsettled and exploratory academic environment. The choice led him into a different application of machine learning, one in which the consequences of misreading a human being could arrive at highway speed. [3]

[External image / 外部圖片] Lex Fridman in a dark suit and tie before a blackboard with equations and writing.
Fridman in the teaching photograph published on his website. Photographer not stated · Rights retained by the source and respective rights holders; no open license stated. · Image source

2. Judo, jiu-jitsu, and the first interviews

The academic chronology alone misses an apprenticeship. In Philadelphia, Fridman trained in judo and then Brazilian jiu-jitsu, eventually earning a black belt. Crowell interviewed his former judo coach Ray Huxen, who remembered the intensity with which he committed himself to improving. The gym supplied people worth questioning before the AI laboratory supplied a podcast roster. [2]

A surviving video uploaded in June 2014 shows the earlier programme's name, Take It Uneasy, attached to an interview with grappler Ryan Hall about self-defense. Its existence establishes something easy to lose in the later origin story: Fridman was recording conversations in the year of his doctorate, four years before the AI series. His graduate research and first experiments with interviewing overlapped. [9]

By 2017, he could discuss autonomous-driving research with Software Engineering Daily and explain how his own athlete interviews explored fear and overcoming difficulty. Engineering and interviewing were developing together, rather than one profession simply succeeding the other. [5]

Books and a Russian-speaking intellectual upbringing

In a 2021 conversation with Andrew Huberman, Fridman recalled demanding mathematics, neighbors gathering with guitars, and family memories shadowed by war and Soviet hardship. He described the sentimental intensity of that world as part of his own formation. These were personal memories, not evidence for a universal Russian temperament. They help explain why his later interviews move readily between a technical problem and questions about loneliness, suffering or friendship. In the same conversation, he described grappling as a way to form unusually close bonds with people. [10]

His literary interests have a similarly long history. Looking back during his 2025 visit to India, he said he had read Hermann Hesse as a teenager and repeatedly returned to Siddhartha. He placed that reading beside Dostoevsky, Camus, Kafka and other writers who had made the human condition a personal question for him. The later podcast did not have to acquire a separate "philosophy" identity to accommodate those interests. [11]

3. The MIT work: seeing the driver as well as the road

At MIT’s AgeLab, Fridman worked in the multidisciplinary environment led by transportation researcher Bryan Reimer. A 2017 MIT account describes him leading seven computer engineers in a collaboration with Toyota’s Collaborative Safety Research Center. One project placed a stationary camera at a busy Cambridge intersection and analyzed pedestrians’ movements as they decided whether to cross. Another directed cameras inward, toward the driver’s face, head position and signs of attention or fatigue. The engineering problem had two sides: perceive the traffic and understand the person expected to cooperate with the automation. [6]

The scale and organization of that work are clearer in the MIT Advanced Vehicle Technology Study paper, published in IEEE Access in 2019. Fridman and seventeen coauthors described an instrumented fleet including Tesla, Volvo, Range Rover and Cadillac vehicles. Video of faces, cabins and roads was combined with vehicle and motion data. The reported dataset then covered more than half a million miles and 122 participants. Collecting it was only one task; synchronizing streams, annotating behavior and extracting usable signals required a continuing technical infrastructure. The paper is distinct from the Tesla vigilance report that became controversial. [7]

Arguing Machines, written with Li Ding, Benedikt Jenik and Reimer, examined another problem: when should a human be asked to supervise a black-box AI system? Their proposal used a separately trained second system, with disagreement identifying cases for human attention. They tested it on image classification and semi-autonomous driving data. The emphasis was on identifying the moments that needed supervision, rather than assuming the machine could perform reliably without it. [8]

In an October 2018 CSAIL talk, he presented driver-state sensing, voice-mediated transfers of control and the annotation of naturalistic driving data. The institutional record also credits a CHI 2017 best-paper award and a 2018 honorable mention. His role was that of a research scientist, not an MIT professor. His research record is neither imaginary nor a license to treat him as an expert on every subject his podcast would eventually cover. [12]

4. The AI series, Rogan, and the Tesla breakthrough

Fridman was also teaching: MIT's lecture archive preserves his 2017–18 talks on deep learning, computer vision and artificial general intelligence. The new interview series grew out of that educational work in 2018. [42] Its first Max Tegmark conversation concerned Life 3.0, the physicist's book about humanity's future with AI. That subject already allowed engineering to open into existential questions. The surviving episode page is modest: an audio download, a video link, the guest's institutional identity and his book. [13] [40]

On October 24, 2018, Fridman appeared on The Joe Rogan Experience. The encounter placed an MIT-associated researcher before an audience accustomed to moving among combat sports, comedy, science and personal experience. The earlier martial-arts life made this a connection between existing interests, not an inexplicable detour from technology. [14]

Rogan also became an important friend; Fridman later described their affinity to Huberman. [10]

Then, in April 2019, Elon Musk sat for the eighteenth episode. The official title was simply Elon Musk: Tesla Autopilot. This first conversation was far shorter than their later meetings and closely tied to the autonomous-driving work that had made Fridman visible to Tesla's chief executive. [15]

What the Autopilot report did—and did not—show

The surviving report Human Side of Tesla Autopilot proposed “functional vigilance”: judging drivers partly through their decisions about when to use automation and when to take over. Its abstract describes annotation of 18,928 Autopilot disengagements and a relatively high level of vigilance in the studied drivers. The authors argued that diminished attention need not be inevitable in partially automated driving. But they also explicitly warned that the results could not directly establish crash safety, might not generalize to other drivers or software versions, and excluded challenging situations that did not produce disengagement. Those limitations are central to reading the claim. An observation about selected takeovers is not a fleet-wide safety verdict. [16]

Julia Black’s 2023 Business Insider investigation reported researchers’ objections to the sample, possible observer effects and publicity before peer review. It also reported that Fridman blocked academics who challenged the work, and that Musk’s enthusiasm for the report preceded the invitation to Tesla. The report’s removal from MIT’s website was reported without an established explanation. These are attributed findings, not proof of research fraud or a documented reason for an employment change. [17]

The breakthrough therefore had two consequences at once. It gave the interviewer access to an unusually consequential technology executive, while making his scientific judgment and independence subjects of public dispute. The disagreement did not arrive after a neutral research career had ended: it formed part of the route by which that career became a media career.

That sequence also helps explain how the programme grew. Technical credibility, audience attention and personal access could become resources for one another: scientific guests established a setting for difficult explanation; Rogan brought the researcher before a wider audience; the Musk interviews made the programme more visible as a venue for technology leadership. This is a reading of the documented sequence, not evidence that one guest arranged the next booking. Fridman was building a network across institutions whose usual criteria for authority were quite different.

5. Learning to sustain a conversation

In 2020, the AI podcast was renamed the Lex Fridman Podcast. [17]

As the programme expanded, Fridman retained the elementary question and the large closing question. By September 2021, the same feed could devote an episode to philosopher Sean Kelly, with Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, Heidegger and the possibility of AI-made art all in its published itinerary. [18]

Crowell records Fridman identifying himself with Dostoevsky’s The Idiot in that conversation. The novel became one explicit reference for his self-presentation as a sincere, sometimes naive questioner. [2]

He offered Huberman a more operational account of the format: microphones give two people permission to focus on one another for much longer than they normally would. The usefulness lies partly in staying with a question neither participant has settled. [10]

Fridman’s own account of preparation describes reading favorable and critical perspectives, taking notes and sometimes trying technical guests’ software or ideas. Questions come later, shaped by what he wants explained. [30]

Carmack and the expanding technical archive

The August 2022 John Carmack episode lasted more than five hours. Its documented subjects included programming, the making of id Software’s games, virtual reality, aerospace and artificial general intelligence. It is a conspicuous marker of how far the programme had traveled from the compact Musk interview: the guest’s working history could occupy most of an afternoon. The programme could accommodate a guest whose principal claim on the audience was a lifetime spent making software. [19]

Tao: a liquid computer, then a correction

In the 2025 Terence Tao interview, Fridman asks at 18:54 how a hypothetical computer made of fluid might help address the Navier–Stokes equations. Tao explains why transferring energy too indiscriminately between scales lets viscosity dissipate it; a carefully sequenced mechanism might avoid that problem. He distinguishes his result for a modified equation from the much harder unfinished proposal for the actual equations. [20]

At 25:40 Fridman calls the connection a “leap of genius.” Tao replies, “there’s precedent,” and explains constructions in Conway’s Game of Life, including contributions by amateurs. Fridman then asks whether the complex behavior arising from simple rules can be analyzed mathematically. Tao supplies another qualification: the elaborate structures require specially arranged initial conditions. Fridman follows by asking whether that necessity can itself be proved. [20]

On the transcript page, admiration leads into explanation, a correction, and a further question about the correction’s reach. Fridman knows enough to name the proposed connection, but leaves Tao room to distinguish a proved result, a speculative route and its predecessors. [20]

6. Recording technology and the people behind it

Fridman’s technical interests sometimes alter how the interview is made. For his September 2023 conversation with Mark Zuckerberg, he traveled to Pittsburgh for detailed scanning, then participated remotely as a photorealistic avatar. Early in the exchange, he asks how their faces can look so convincing. Zuckerberg explains the models built from scans and expressions. Fridman’s next practical question concerns the lengthy scanning process he has just undergone: how could this become accessible to ordinary users? Zuckerberg describes the hoped-for reduction to a brief phone scan. [21]

Their shared jiu-jitsu also enters the exchange, when Zuckerberg jokes about the avatar’s proximity compared with their physical training. The episode is at once a demonstration, an interview and a meeting between people with an existing relationship. The useful specificity comes when experience of the prototype gives him a concrete bottleneck to ask about. [21]

FFmpeg, VLC and volunteer maintenance

By May 2026, he was interviewing Jean-Baptiste Kempf of VideoLAN and longtime FFmpeg contributor Kieran Kunhya. These are less publicly celebrated figures than the founders who made his channel famous. Their work is nevertheless close to his own production: software for moving, encoding and playing video. The episode page identifies their roles and supplies links to both projects. [22]

The conversation moves beyond code to who does the work. About seventy minutes into the conversation, Fridman asks Kunhya to explain a dispute with Google security researchers. Kunhya describes the pressure that vulnerability reports and disclosure deadlines put on volunteers. Fridman restates the issue, then asks him to present Google’s case. Kunhya acknowledges the company’s resources and contributions before returning to the imbalance between discovering flaws and repairing them. Elsewhere, Kempf recounts declining commercial offers that would compromise VLC’s ad-free character. [23]

Here the host’s habitual interest in how something gets made reaches maintenance, financing and refusal. The exchange offers a different technology career from the billionaire-founder story: keeping widely used infrastructure working when the users’ resources exceed the maintainers’ resources. [23]

7. Friendship, political access and the limits of follow-up

Personal relationships became part of the programme’s public circumstances. In November 2023, Fridman posted that he had spent Thanksgiving with Ivanka Trump, Jared Kushner and their family, watching The Godfather. This was not a relationship inferred from a guest list: he made the social occasion public himself. When Donald Trump appeared the following September, the interviewer was already connected to his family’s world. [24]

Helen Lewis’s contemporary Atlantic assessment credited Fridman with raising uncomfortable subjects, including the election and Jeffrey Epstein, while questioning the lack of journalistic distance. Her account placed the appearance within Trump’s wider use of male-oriented online media. The access was valuable to both parties, though that does not establish that a particular question was traded for it. [25]

Trump: three returns to an election question

At 15:47 in the September 2024 transcript, Fridman frames the 2020 election issue through independent voters who like some of Trump’s policies but are troubled by his fraud claims. Trump repeats that the election was fraudulent, then shifts to immigration. At 19:29 Fridman returns, distinguishing concerns about media bias from the claim of widespread fraud. Trump says he is focused on the future and moves into Afghanistan. After briefly pursuing that subject, Fridman returns again at 21:44, asking how to avoid another divisive election whether Trump wins or loses. Trump predicts a victory; the conversation proceeds to deportation. [26]

That sequence is more revealing than either “he never challenged Trump” or “he asked the hard question.” He did return. What he did not do in this passage was demand substantiation or examine evidence for the fraud claim. His questions increasingly addressed reassurance and future conduct, while the disputed account of the previous election remained unresolved. That is a limitation visible in the exchange, without requiring a theory about his private motives. [26]

Ye and the argument over empathy

There have also been moments of direct disagreement. In the October 2022 Ye interview, Fridman challenged the musician’s treatment of Jewish people as a collective culprit rather than individuals. Nathan J. Robinson’s Current Affairs critique acknowledges that pushback, but argues that the friendly format still left too much room for antisemitic claims. Robinson’s larger objection is ethical: sympathy for all parties can neglect the unequal positions of those harming others and those being harmed. [27]

These exchanges expose a distinction between affective trust—the confidence that one will be heard without humiliation—and epistemic trust, confidence in the practices used to assess a claim. The first can encourage candor; it cannot itself establish the second. Fridman’s objection to Ye shows that personal concern need not exclude disagreement. His returns to the election question show why raising an uncomfortable topic can still leave its central assertion untested. The limitation is not warmth itself, but what happens to the claims that warmth helps elicit. [26] [27]

8. Israel–Palestine, Kyiv and India

The international work did not settle into a single format. In 2023 Fridman interviewed Benjamin Netanyahu and Palestinian writer Mohammed El-Kurd separately. In March 2024 he convened Norman Finkelstein, Benny Morris, Mouin Rabbani and Steven Bonnell, known as Destiny, for a long Israel–Palestine debate. The encounter brought historians, political argument and internet debate culture together, with disputes over texts and interpretations often becoming disputes over the participants themselves. Fridman’s introduction explains his decision to use no time limits or formal rules. He says he chose to let the emotional exchanges unfold rather than moderate them strictly. He treated the tension itself as something the audience should see. [29] [39] [41]

The Netanyahu transcript also shows the limits of access to an officeholder. When the discussion reaches West Bank settlements, Netanyahu advances a historical claim to the territory; Fridman’s next question follows the turn toward Saudi diplomacy rather than pressing the objection about settlements. Publishing another guest’s perspective elsewhere in the archive does not supply the missing interrogation inside this encounter. [28]

Kyiv: language and an imperfect audio system

In January 2025, Fridman interviewed Volodymyr Zelenskyy in a mixture of Ukrainian, Russian and English. Fridman wanted to use Russian, their shared fluent language; Zelenskyy explained why the language of the invading state could not be treated as a neutral convenience. When Fridman proposed a language of love, Zelenskyy answered with respect. The host's own linguistic background had become part of the negotiation, rather than an invisible tool for conducting it. [30]

His postscript describes a very material difficulty: loud noise in his interpreter feed, a quiet translated voice and incomplete rendering that he had to piece together. After recording, rapid translation across three languages created six directions of conversion. He credits ElevenLabs for voice synthesis, distinguishes that from translation done by humans and AI, and acknowledges insufficient time spent choosing translators. This is a specific production failure and a stated plan to improve, not evidence that the entire process was subsequently repaired. [30]

The published episode provides multiple audio tracks and identifies its default as an English overdub; the original mixed-language recording is available under the English (UK) track. That choice changes what a listener encounters. The apparently fluent English conversation is one produced version of a multilingual event, not the language in which every answer was given. The episode's own distribution instructions make the distinction inspectable. [31]

India: entering a guest's world

Before interviewing Narendra Modi in March 2025, Fridman fasted for about forty-five hours. He discussed the experience with the prime minister and asked about spiritual practice, alongside political questions. The preparation joined his longstanding literary interests to an attempt to experience something important to the guest. In the same transcript, however, Modi's favorable account of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), introduced by Fridman as a Hindu-nationalist organization, receives little sustained challenge. Respectful immersion can produce revealing personal material while leaving an officeholder's political self-description largely intact. [11]

9. The continuing work of a media business

The international episodes make visible labor that the familiar two-person image can conceal. Fridman’s public hiring page seeks researchers, video editors, camera operators, translators, programmers and accounting support. It separately advertises editors for short excerpts on TikTok, Instagram and YouTube Shorts. The advertised roles span both making the programme and keeping it in circulation. [32]

The long episode, searchable transcript, chapter list, audio feed and short clip are different ways of reaching the audience. Fridman’s official archive directs users to the main channel and a separate clips channel, podcast services and RSS. A listener can spend an afternoon with one guest; another may meet the same guest in a minute-long excerpt. The distribution system has to serve both, rather than operating outside short-form media simply because its flagship conversations are long. [1]

The public revenue model is equally visible but only to a point. Sponsor pages name services and products and give listener offers; episode pages encourage their use and also link to voluntary support. The May 2026 FFmpeg episode, for example, lists AI and software businesses alongside consumer services. These disclosures establish advertising and sponsorship as part of the operation. They do not disclose Fridman’s personal income, profit, staffing costs or the terms of particular deals. [22] [33]

Credibility consequently has several jobs in this business: attracting listeners, making a sponsor’s association valuable, reassuring potential guests and supporting further access. Those jobs need not always align. A rigorous challenge may strengthen a listener’s trust while straining a friendship or making another guest less willing to appear; familiarity with the host may also make an advertisement feel closer to a personal recommendation. These are structural possibilities arising from the disclosed model, not evidence that an interview was bought or a question suppressed.

His own answers to criticism have become part of the product too. Introducing Ezra Klein and Derek Thompson in 2025, he defended the political interviews, rejected audience-capture accusations and said scientific, creative and technical guests remained his preferred territory. The conversation itself allowed Thompson to criticize Musk’s government-efficiency project despite Fridman’s personal closeness to Musk. It is another reason not to flatten the programme into a party organ. At the same time, receiving attacks from several directions does not independently demonstrate freedom from the incentives of friendship, access or audience. [34]

10. The researcher and the host, now

The programme’s scale is no longer in doubt. In July 2026, TIME reported more than five million YouTube subscribers and a billion total views when it included Fridman in its creator list. It described him as a former MIT researcher. [35]

That wording, however, does not align neatly with the public LIDS directory, which still lists him as a research scientist. His MIT-hosted page describes the appointment as current in 2025. Those sources establish a real affiliation and a public-status discrepancy; they do not settle his precise November 2026 employment arrangements. [36] [37]

The work on display is easier to verify than that boundary. As checked for this revision, the archive still prominently features programming, mathematics, psychiatry and martial arts alongside political and executive interviews. His website also retains research publications, teaching materials and music performances. The earlier worlds have not disappeared from the public career, even as the microphone has become its most conspicuous instrument. [1] [38]

The archive places a technical oral history, a prototype demonstration and an officeholder’s self-description in the same familiar setting. That continuity lets a listener cross between worlds, but it can also carry credibility earned in one kind of conversation into another where different checks are needed. This is a risk in the format, not a claim that every listener makes that transfer.

Fridman now has to move between tasks that once belonged to separate parts of his life: following a technical explanation, eliciting a working history, testing an officeholder’s answer, managing a recording and sustaining a business. The archive contains examples of each, with unequal results. Its present shape is most clearly seen in the continued proximity of the programmer, the grappler, the scientist and the political guest—and in the specific choices Fridman makes when each takes the seat opposite him.

Sources

The close readings above use published transcripts; timestamps refer to those transcripts and can differ from ad-bearing episode versions. These transcripts carry their publishers' error warnings. They are not independently verified verbatim audio transcripts.

1. Podcast archive
2. Maddy Crowell, "The Idiot," Columbia Journalism Review, December 8, 2025
3. Wendy Plump, Drexel Engineering profile, October 2, 2018
4. Drexel dissertation record and abstract, 2014
5. Software Engineering Daily, self-driving deep learning interview transcript, 2017; especially 3:36–5:35
6. Christine Adams, MIT News on AgeLab's Toyota collaboration, June 8, 2017
7. Fridman and coauthors, MIT Advanced Vehicle Technology Study, IEEE Access, 2019; arXiv record
8. Fridman, Ding, Jenik and Reimer, Arguing Machines, 2017–18
9. Ryan Hall, Take It Uneasy video; upload metadata June 11, 2014
10. Huberman Lab, Lex Fridman interview and transcript, July 19, 2021
11. Narendra Modi interview transcript, 2025; fasting, RSS and literary postscript
12. MIT CSAIL, Human-Centered Autonomous Vehicles, October 30, 2018
13. Max Tegmark, Life 3.0, first AI podcast episode, 2018
14. JRE Library, Joe Rogan Experience 1188, October 24, 2018
15. Elon Musk, Tesla Autopilot, April 12, 2019
16. Fridman and coauthors, Human Side of Tesla Autopilot; publicly indexed report copy, abstract and limitations
17. Julia Black, Business Insider investigation, April 12, 2023
18. Sean Kelly episode record, September 30, 2021
19. John Carmack episode record, August 4, 2022
20. Terence Tao transcript, 2025; 18:54–30:16
21. Mark Zuckerberg avatar interview transcript, 2023; 0:00–10:05

22. FFmpeg episode record, May 6, 2026
23. FFmpeg and VLC transcript; especially 55:46–1:18:24
24. Fridman’s public Thanksgiving post, 2023
25. Helen Lewis, Trump’s Red-Pill Podcast Tour, The Atlantic, September 4, 2024
26. Donald Trump interview transcript, September 2024; 15:47–22:29
27. Nathan J. Robinson, The Guy Who Just Loves Everyone, Current Affairs, January 5, 2023
28. Benjamin Netanyahu transcript, 2023; 46:39–51:56
29. Israel–Palestine debate transcript, 2024; introduction and moderation account
30. Volodymyr Zelenskyy transcript, 2025; language discussion and production/preparation postscript
31. Zelenskyy episode record and audio-track instructions, January 5, 2025
32. Fridman’s hiring page; public advertised roles, checked November 1, 2026
33. Fridman’s sponsors page, checked November 1, 2026
34. Ezra Klein and Derek Thompson transcript, 2025; introduction and government-efficiency discussion
35. Leslie Horn Peterson, TIME100 Creators profile, July 14, 2026
36. MIT LIDS public research-staff directory, checked November 1, 2026
37. Fridman’s MIT-hosted research page, explicitly dated current in 2025
38. Fridman’s official website: research, teaching and music links
39. Mohammed El-Kurd episode record, July 24, 2023
40. Max Tegmark original video: first-episode identification and April 19, 2018 upload metadata
41. Israel–Palestine debate episode record, March 14, 2024
42. MIT-hosted lecture archive, 2017–2020