A: AN ANALYSIS OF OUR ORDINARY CONCEPTION OF MORALITY
1) What is unconditionally good/valuable? Only a good will: anything else (e.g. consequences, intentions, objects) can sometimes be bad/immoral, but a good will never can.
2) What is a good will? Kant considers examples to show that mere inclination isn’t it (e.g. the man who is naturally sympathetic) and nor is acting for some other goal (e.g. the merchant wanting to make money); having a good will involves acting out of duty. (And a bad will involves not acting out of duty.)
3) What is acting out of duty? Acting so as to follow a maxim (which is roughly a conception of a law: e.g. “never tell a lie”).
4) So what is the right thing to do? To perform actions because you recognise it is your duty (i.e. following a maxim). Since maxims are lawlike, this gives us the first version of the Categorical Imperative:

Do not act in such a way that you could not will that your maxim be a universal law: i.e. only act on maxims, and something is only really a maxim if it is universalizable.

B: WHAT MORE CAN PHILOSOPHY TELL US ABOUT THE CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE?
1) How does the Categorical Imperative produce moral conclusions? By ruling out possible maxims as not in fact being universalizable (and so forbidding us to act on those maxims).
2) What does it mean to say a maxim can’t be universalised? It means that a universal law of nature corresponding to that maxim is rationally impossible for you to will because either a) such a law of nature just couldn’t exist, or b) you would be logically contradicting yourself in willing it. The former is called “contradiction in conception,” and an example would be ‘always break your promises’; the latter is called “contradiction in the will,” and an example would be ‘never help others.’
3) Since morality is based on maxims, and thus on universal laws, it cannot be based on hypothetical imperatives: this is why the imperative must be categorical. But this introduces a problem we need to solve: we know when and why it is rational to follow hypothetical imperatives (‘if you want X then do Y’ ... and I do want X); but it is not clear why we should feel committed to categorical imperatives (‘do Y’).
4) So why should we follow the Categorical Imperative? There are two reasons: because A) every rational being is an ‘end in themselves’ and we must respect that; and because B) we essentially ‘legislate’ these maxims for ourselves.
   A) Why do we formulate maxims? Because we have some end in view. Why is this goal important? In the end, all goals are important only because someone thinks they are important, and that they want it is what gives it value in the first place: nothing is important unless people are. So rational agents are the ultimate sources of value. So we get the second version of the
Categorical Imperative: “Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only.”

B) Why should we follow laws? Either because we agree with it or because we get some reward for doing so. The latter kind of reason is merely hypothetical, and so not a proper grounding for morality. But the former kind is categorical: we just think the law is right—we autonomously (as opposed to heteronomously) choose it. So our obligation to follow the moral law arises from our own autonomy—our capacity to choose general principles of action. This gives us the third form of the categorical imperative: “Act as if it in choosing a maxim you are legislating it as a universal law for yourself and all the other members of the ‘kingdom of ends’.”

C: WHY BE MORAL?
1) Kant takes himself to have shown that if we are rational and autonomous, we will choose the moral law, and so commit ourselves to following that law. What he needs to do now is show that we are free in the right kind of way—that we can freely choose how to act, and our actions are not determined (by, e.g., the laws of physics)...