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**The Dangers of Change Approval Processes**

It has long been believed that change approval procedures are essential to guaranteeing safe and secure software updates. To control perceived risks, many businesses use formal request processes or manual approvals via Change Advisory Boards (CABs). Current research, however, indicates that these manual procedures frequently cause more harm than help. According to DORA, external approval processes—such as CABs—do not improve change failure rates and are consistently associated with slower delivery and worse operational performance (DORA, n.d.). In many cases, these processes delay valuable feedback, cause deployment bottlenecks, and increase the size and risk of software releases.

One reason for the ineffectiveness of heavy approval processes is that they create what DORA calls the “risk paradox.” Slower approvals mean developers bundle changes into larger batches, making failures more likely and recovery more difficult (DORA, n.d.). Additionally, LaunchDarkly emphasizes that companies that depend on outside approvals typically have poorer software delivery results, which frequently result in irate teams and preventable delays (LaunchDarkly, n.d.). These manual procedures take the emphasis off of ongoing development and add needless red tape, which hinders teams' ability to pick things up fast and solve problems efficiently.

Experts advise using more contemporary options like automated CI/CD pipelines and peer reviews in place of manual gates like CABs. Automation guarantees uniform testing and deployment procedures, while peer reviews preserve control and supervision without adding delays (DORA, n.d.). Octopus Deploy supports this approach by emphasizing that automated procedures that are combined with peer reviews can result in safer and faster outcomes than traditional manual approvals (Octopus Deploy, 2020). Also these methods enhance security and compliance by automating tracking and evidence collection.

In conclusion, organizations that rely on heavy change approval processes risk slowing innovation and increasing deployment failures. Research from DORA, LaunchDarkly, and Octopus Deploy all support the idea that automated processes and peer reviews lead to better outcomes. Businesses may deploy software more safely and effectively without the needless bottlenecks of manual change approvals by optimizing approval procedures and utilizing contemporary DevOps techniques.
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