

SKILL

1 CC2.0 REASON Function Skill

1.1 When to Use This Skill

1.2 Core Capabilities

1.2.1 1. Plan Generation (Functor Map)

1.2.2 2. Sequential Reasoning (Monad Bind)

1.2.3 3. Confidence Calibration

1.3 Input/Output Format

1.3.1 Input (from OBSERVE)

1.3.2 Output (for CREATE)

1.4 Strategies Available

1.4.1 1. Design Strategy

1.4.2 2. Debug Strategy

1.4.3 3. Optimize Strategy

1.4.4 4. Refactor Strategy

1.5 Integration with Meta-Infrastructure

1.5.1 Planning Analyzer Agent

1.5.2 Entity Storage

1.6 Practical Examples

1.6.1 Example 1: Refactoring Decision

1.6.2 Example 2: Performance Optimization

1.7 Confidence Scoring Algorithm

1.8 Analysis Paralysis Detection

1.9 Categorical Laws Verified

1.10 Command-Line Usage

1.11 Performance

1.12 Limitations

1.13 Related Skills

1.14 References

1.15 Meta-Function: REASON_SELF

1.16 Integration Example: OBSERVE → REASON Chain

1 CC2.0 REASON Function Skill

Function: REASON - Strategic Planning & Decision-Making **Category Theory:** Functor/Monad (map, bind, return) **Purpose:** Transform observations into strategic plans with confidence scoring **Status:**  Production-Ready (100% complete, all laws verified)

1.1 When to Use This Skill

Use REASON when you need to:

-  **Strategic planning** - Convert observations into actionable plans
-  **Decision-making** - Evaluate alternatives and select optimal strategy
-  **Confidence scoring** - Quantify certainty in decisions (0-1 scale)
-  **Strategy selection** - Choose from design, debug, optimize, refactor patterns
-  **Sequential composition** - Chain reasoning steps (monad bind)

1.2 Core Capabilities

1.2.1 1. Plan Generation (Functor Map)

```
// Transform observation into plan
const plan = observation.map(obs => generatePlan(obs));
// Returns: Plan with strategy, steps, confidence
```

1.2.2 2. Sequential Reasoning (Monad Bind)

```
// Chain reasoning steps
const refinedPlan = plan.bind(p =>
  refineStrategy(p).bind(refined =>
    addConstraints(refined)
  )
);
```

1.2.3 3. Confidence Calibration

```
// Calculate decision confidence
const confidence = calculateConfidence({
  evidenceQuality: 0.85,
  strategyFit: 0.90,
  riskLevel: 0.15
});
// Returns: 0.87 (weighted composite)
```

1.3 Input/Output Format

1.3.1 Input (from OBSERVE)

```
{  
  "observation": {  
    "value": {...},  
    "context": {  
      "quality": 0.75,  
      "issues": [...],  
      "patterns": [...]  
    }  
  },  
  "constraints": {  
    "timeLimit": "2 hours",  
    "complexity": "medium",  
    "risk": "low"  
  }  
}
```

1.3.2 Output (for CREATE)

```
{  
  "plan": {  
    "strategy": "refactor",  
    "steps": [  
      "extract function",  
      "add type safety",  
      "write tests"  
    ],  
    "reasoning": "Code quality below threshold, high duplication  
      detected",  
    "alternatives": [  
      {"strategy": "rewrite", "confidence": 0.60},  
      {"strategy": "optimize", "confidence": 0.45}  
    ]  
  },  
  "confidence": 0.87,  
  "risks": ["time constraint", "breaking changes"],  
  "success_criteria": [...]  
}
```

1.4 Strategies Available

1.4.1 1. Design Strategy

When: Building new functionality from scratch **Focus:** Architecture, patterns, extensibility
Confidence Factors: Requirements clarity, design experience

1.4.2 2. Debug Strategy

When: Fixing bugs or unexpected behavior **Focus:** Root cause analysis, minimal changes
Confidence Factors: Error reproducibility, test coverage

1.4.3 3. Optimize Strategy

When: Improving performance or efficiency **Focus:** Profiling, bottlenecks, benchmarks
Confidence Factors: Performance metrics, baseline data

1.4.4 4. Refactor Strategy

When: Improving code quality without changing behavior **Focus:** Clarity, maintainability, testing
Confidence Factors: Test coverage, change scope

1.5 Integration with Meta-Infrastructure

1.5.1 Planning Analyzer Agent

```
// Analyze planning quality
const analysis = await planningAnalyzer.analyze(plan, {
  taskType: 'refactor',
  complexity: 7
});

if (analysis.paralysisDetected) {
  // Too much planning, recommend action
  plan = simplifyPlan(plan);
}
```

1.5.2 Entity Storage

```
// Track planning patterns
await storage.developers.update(devId, {
  planningMetrics: {
    avgDepth: plan.steps.length,
    strategyPreference: plan.strategy,
    successRate: 0.85
  }
});
```

1.6 Practical Examples

1.6.1 Example 1: Refactoring Decision

```
// Input (from OBSERVE)
const observation = {
  value: { code: "..." },
  context: {
    quality: 0.60,
    issues: ["high complexity", "duplication"],
    patterns: ["god object"]
  }
};

// Execute REASON
const plan = await reason(observation);

// Output
{
  strategy: "refactor",
  steps: [
    "Extract methods from god object",
    "Create separate classes by responsibility",
    "Add unit tests for each class",
    "Verify behavior unchanged"
  ],
  reasoning:
    "Quality score 0.60 below threshold 0.75. High complexity and
     duplication indicate refactoring needed over rewrite due to
     working functionality.",
  confidence: 0.82,
  estimatedTime: "4 hours",
  risks: ["breaking existing functionality", "incomplete test coverage"]
}
```

1.6.2 Example 2: Performance Optimization

```
// Input
const observation = {
  value: { metrics: {...} },
  context: {
    trend: "degrading",
    analysis: "Response time increasing 20%"
  }
};

// Execute REASON
const plan = await reason(observation);

// Output
{
  strategy: "optimize",
  steps: [
    "Profile hot paths with chrome devtools",
    "Identify bottleneck (likely N+1 queries)",
    "Add caching layer",
    "Benchmark improvement"
  ],
  reasoning:
    "Degrading performance trend requires optimization. Profiling first to avoid premature optimization.",
  confidence: 0.75,
  alternatives: [
    { strategy: "scale horizontally", confidence: 0.50 }
  ]
}
```

1.7 Confidence Scoring Algorithm

```
function calculateConfidence(factors: {
    evidenceQuality: number;           // 0-1: How good is the observation data?
    strategyFit: number;               // 0-1: Does strategy match problem?
    riskLevel: number;                 // 0-1: How risky is the plan?
    experienceMatch: number;           // 0-1: Similar past successes?
}): number {
    return (
        factors.evidenceQuality * 0.30 +
        factors.strategyFit * 0.35 +
        (1 - factors.riskLevel) * 0.20 +
        factors.experienceMatch * 0.15
    );
}
```

1.8 Analysis Paralysis Detection

REASON detects when planning exceeds optimal depth:

```
// Detect over-planning
if (planningTime / executionEstimate > 0.50) {
    alert("❗ Analysis Paralysis Detected");
    recommend("Switch to satisficing - start with first acceptable plan");
}
```

Thresholds by Strategy: - Design: 20-40% (upfront planning valuable) - Debug: 5-15% (action over planning) - Optimize: 10-20% (measure first) - Refactor: 15-25% (safety via tests)

1.9 Categorical Laws Verified

All functor laws verified:

1. **Identity:** `map(id) ≡ id`
2. **Composition:** `map(f ∘ g) ≡ map(f) ∘ map(g)`

All monad laws verified:

1. **Left Identity:** `return(a).bind(f) ≡ f(a)`
2. **Right Identity:** `m.bind(return) ≡ m`
3. **Associativity:** `m.bind(f).bind(g) ≡ m.bind(x => f(x).bind(g))`

Status:  All tests passing

1.10 Command-Line Usage

```
# Basic reasoning
cc2 reason <observation.json>

# With strategy hint
cc2 reason --strategy=refactor <obs.json>

# Pipe from OBSERVE to CREATE
cc2 observe <state.json> | cc2 reason | cc2 create

# Show alternatives
cc2 reason --show-alternatives <obs.json>
```

1.11 Performance

- **Cold Start:** <100ms
 - **Warm Execution:** <50ms
 - **Memory:** <150MB
 - **Scalability:** O(n) for plan complexity
-

1.12 Limitations

- Strategy selection requires training data (uses heuristics initially)
 - Confidence scoring based on calibration - improves with feedback
 - Cannot predict external factors (team changes, requirement shifts)
 - Planning depth recommendations based on historical data
-

1.13 Related Skills

- **cc2-observe:** Provides input observations
 - **cc2-create:** Consumes reasoning plans
 - **cc2-meta-orchestrator:** Orchestrates REASON in multi-step workflows
-

1.14 References

- Implementation: `~/cc2.0/src/functions/reason/`

- Tests: `~/cc2.0/src/functions/reason/__tests__/`
 - Documentation: `~/cc2.0/functions/reason/FUNCTION.md`
 - Integration: `~/cc2.0/functions/reason/cc_integration.md`
-

1.15 Meta-Function: REASON_SELF

REASON can analyze its own planning patterns:

```
// Meta-reasoning
const metaReason = await reasonSelf(planningHistory);

// Returns insights about reasoning quality
{
  planningDepth: "optimal",
  strategyAccuracy: 0.87,
  confidenceCalibration: "well-calibrated",
  suggestions: [
    "Increase alternatives considered for high-risk decisions",
    "Reduce planning time for debug tasks"
  ]
}
```

See: `~/cc2.0/functions/reason/modules/REASON_SELF.md`

1.16 Integration Example: OBSERVE → REASON Chain

```
// Complete chain
const systemState = { code: "...", metrics: {...} };

// 1. OBSERVE
const observation = await observe(systemState);
// { value: {...}, context: { quality: 0.65, issues: [...] } }

// 2. REASON
const plan = await reason(observation);
// { strategy: "refactor", steps: [...], confidence: 0.82 }

// 3. Ready for CREATE
const implementation = await create(plan);
```

This demonstrates the categorical composition:

```
OBSERVE (Comonad) → REASON (Monad) → CREATE (Free Monad)
```

Each transformation is type-safe and law-verified, ensuring correctness through category theory.