1. Methods

FoPIA:

The framework of FoPIA has been described in Figure 1. It was conducted in three phases:

- (1) Preparation phase. We conducted the preparation workshop with transdisciplinary experts, communicated regional land use problems, driving forces and land management and policies. Drafted local LUFs and associated assessment indicators would be prepared for the next phase.
- (2) Participatory evaluation. The second workshop contains four parts. The first part we set down the LUFs and indicators. The second part is a paper-based assessment. With two rounds of assessment and discussion, we obtained the weights of LUFs in terms of their importance for the study site region from 0 (not important) to 5 (extremely important), and if developed as usual, the impacts on local LUFs in the next 10 years has been evaluated by scores between −3 (most negative impacts) to 3 (most positive impacts). In the third part, we assessed the relationship of local land-use types and land-use functions act as the foundation for the visualization of the land-use assessment results in the agent base model. The fourth part provides further suggestions for researchers to do a depth field survey, including choosing the specific study site to make the samples more scientific.
- (3) Analysis of the results followed by the preparation of recommendations. The final phase is to share and discuss the results with local experts and researchers, and provide recommendations. Detailed process in FoPIA has been explained in 2018 by Xue and Zhen (Xue & Zhen 2018). The number of stakeholders for FoPIA workshops were designed to be manageable and effective in the range of 10-15 (Morris et al. 2011). The principle for experts in workshops is transdisciplinary, experienced in local land management, especially for the second workshop which undertakes the main definition and assessment work. We carried out the first preparation workshop in September 2015 with 10 policymakers (Wang & Zhen 2017), with at least 8 years of local work experience. The second workshop was held in May 2017, with 5 policymakers and 5 researchers who were all experts on regional land use and the local participants had at least 9 years of work experience in this field (Xue & Zhen 2018).



Figure 1. FoPIA framework

Agent based-model

The model consists of four sub-models with four kinds of agents. Sub-models including individual status transferring sub-model, households' classification sub-model, spatial environment distribution sub-model and households' farmland-use decisions sub-model. Agents are individuals, households, household group, and government. The interface of the agent-based model is in Figure 2 and developed with Java language and RePast simulation platform.

(1) Sub-models

Individual status transferring sub-model

The individual agent behaviours include birthing, educating, farming, migrant working, retiring and dying. Individual status would change with each passing year.

Households' classification sub-model

According to the household economic sources and the household livelihood demand for farmland and non-agricultural labourers, it would be divided into different groups, present group classifications are subsidy-dependent, pure-farming, part-farming, non-farming and pure-outworking groups.

Spatial environment distribution sub-model

This sub-model is designed to describe farmland quality. For example, when households choose to plant at reduced scales, they will rent out or abandon farmland plots with inferior qualities. The quality factors of land would be initialized with remote sensing data.

Households' farmland use decisions sub-model

Farmland-use decision behaviours of the household groups include renting out, renting in, and abandonment of farmland. The households within a group have similar farmland-use behaviours. The percent of each type of household who abandoned or transferred their farmland are extracted by field survey data.

(2) Agents

The individual agent refers to the family members of a household. The household agent is comprised of individual agents, and the corresponding relationship between the household agent and the individual agent is one-to-many. Households in the same households' group would prefer similar land-use decision-making. Government agents would mainly have macroscopic activation, for example, making rules that land above 25 degrees has to be transferred into forest land.

(3) Simulation scope and hypothesis

We tried to conduct the simulation of land-use functions under the context of development, as usual, and make the hypothesis that land-use efficiency and abandonment of agricultural land would continue to follow current trends. The resolution for spatial data is 1 square kilometer. The meteorological data and land cover and land change data was provided by the Data Center for Resources and Environmental Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences (http://www.resdc.cn/).

The simulate year is from 2015 to 2025, in accordance with experts evaluation in the FoPIA.

(4) From land use change to LUFs change

Through the households' farmland-use decisions sub-model, land use will change. Different land-use types have different contributions to LUFs. According to the matrix of land-use types and LUFs in FoPIA, we embed LUFs into land-use types in this model. The evaluation results of LUFs change would also reflect on the running results map from this model.

2. LUFs and indicators

Dimension		Land use functions	Regional relevance	Indicators		
	ECO1	Residential or non-land-based activities	Construction land, and especially residential land, to meet the basic needs of farmers	Percentage of construction land		
Economic	ECO2	Infrastructure	For remote rural areas, the road infrastructure strongly influences the potential for economic development	Density and quality of the transportation network		
	ECO3	Land-based production	Provide a basic income for farmers	The output value of primary agricultural and forest industries		
Social	SOC1	Provision of work	Basic and traditional forms of employment for farmers	The proportion of agricultural employees		
	SOC2	Quality of life	The satisfaction of farmers with their land	Per capita public green space		
	SOC3	Food security	Local farmers would not abandon land because it was necessary to ensure that they received a sufficient quantity and quality of food	Per capita grain output		
	ENV1	Provision of abiotic resources	Water and soil are both essential in this semi-arid area	Per capita water resources		
Environmental	ENV2	Provision of biotic resources	Vegetation cover and diversity indicates an improved environment in this semi-arid region	Vegetation cover of forests and grasses		
	ENV3	Maintenance of ecosystem processes	Undisturbed land is the basis for a local environment-friendly life	Soil conservation		

Table 1. Land-use functions and indicators in Guyuan.

Source: Framework for Participatory Impact Assessment (FoPIA) workshop, 2017.

3. Contribution rate of land-use types to LUFs

Dimension	LUFs	Cultivated land	Forest	Grassland	Body of water	Construction land	Unused land	
Economic	Residential or	2.96	17.14	10.00	0.00	96.42	11 42	
	non-land-based activities	2.80	17.14	10.00	0.00	80.45	11.75	
	Infrastructure	11.43	12.86	3.57	12.86	81.43	20.00	
	Land-based production	84.71	65.71	55.00	24.29	21.43	12.14	
Social	Provision of work	65.71	52.86	42.86	20.71	62.86	7.14	
	Quality of life	64.29	69.29	59.29	60.00	64.29	14.29	
	Food security	87.86	30.00	27.86	24.29	7.14	11.43	
Environmental	Provision of abiotic	(1.42	77.0/	(0.71	71.42	22.57	10.20	
	resources	01.43	//.80	60.71	/1.45	23.57	19.29	
	Provision of biotic resources	59.29	77.14	61.43	60.71	10.71	11.71	
	Maintenance of ecosystem	56 42	01.42	50.20	70.00	22.14	19.14	
	processes	20.43	81.43	39.29	/0.00	22.14	18.14	

4. Questionnaire for household survey

City_ Village Number: Interviewer: Date: ____ Location: County_

Household questionnaire for Land-Use Functions in Guyuan, China

I Basic information

1. Basic information of housholds:

1.	Basic info	ormation of houshold	ls:			-		-		Name of hou	useholder:		Tel:			
	Gender	Relationship with householder	Age	Nation	Education Level	Occupation 1	Location	Occupation 2	Location	Health condition	Insurance	Insurance fee per year	How long stay out of the village per year	Where to live	Why	
1	□M □F			□Han □Hui □						□Good □General □Bad	□Medical □Social □Others					1 Household income per year?
2	□M □F			□Han □Hui □						□Good □General □Bad	□Medical □Social □Others					
3	□M □F			□Han □Hui □						□Good □General □Bad	□Medical □Social □Others					2How long
4	□M □F			□Han □Hui □						□Good □General □Bad	□Medical □Social □Others					have you lived in the village?
5	$\square M$ $\square F$			□Han □Hui □						□Good □General □Bad	□Medical □Social □Others					
6	$\square M$ $\square F$			□Han □Hui □						□Good □General □Bad	□Medical □Social □Others					3If moved
7	□M □F			□Han □Hui □						□Good □General □Bad	□Medical □Social □Others					here several years ago, then why?
8	□M □F			□Han □Hui □						□Good □General □Bad	□Medical □Social □Others					Reason: □for ecocogy □for work
9	□M □F			□Han □Hui □						□Good □General □Bad	□Medical □Social □Others					□for own willingness □other
Notes	M:male F:famale	1=Householder 2=Spouse 3=Children 4=Grandchildren 5=Grandparents 6=Parents 7=Sisters/brothers 8=Others			1-None 2-Primary school 3-Junior school 4-Senior school 5-University	1=Plant 2= Cultivation (livestock) 3=Work part-time 4=Student 5=None 6=Other	1=Village 2=Beyond village 3= Beyond county 4= Beyond province 5= Beyond country_	1=Plant 2= Cultivation (livestock) 3=Work part-time 4=Student 5=None 6=Other	1=Village 2=Beyond village 3= Beyond county 4= Beyond province 5= Beyond country_	Good; General (sometimes sick); Bad				1=Beyond village 2=Beyond county 3=Beyond provi-nce 4=Beyond country	1=Work 2= Marriage 3=Study 4=Other	

2. Basic information about land (First ask the total number of land, if more than 4, please arrange into 4 by slope or plant type. Confirm whether there is abandoned land:											
		Land type	Area ()	Gradient (degree)	Quality	Distance to home	Production (income from land)	Residential area			
	Piece1 <u>mu</u>										
Last year	Piece2 <u>mu</u>										
Total area	Piece3 <u>mu</u>										
	Piece4 <u>mu</u>										
20	Piece1 <u>mu</u>										
20 years ago (1995)	Piece2 <u>mu</u>										
Total area	Piece3 <u>mu</u>										
	Piece4 <u>mu</u>										
		 Cropland Gaden Forest land Grassland others 			 Good Medium Bad 						

II. Scenerios

1. Land transfer:

Period	Wi	llingness	Land type	Area ()	Plant type	Distance to home	Quality	Contractor	Lease period	Price (yuan /mu)	Reason	
		Rent	□Cropland □Grassland □Forest land □				□Good □Medium □Bad	-			□Good benefits □ □Enjoy work on land □Enough labour □To raise livestock	
	Do you want to rent	Yes	□Cropland □Grassland □Forest land □				□Good □Medium □Bad	-			□Good benefits □ □Enjoy work on land □Enough labour □To raise livestock	
	more?	No	Why? \Box Poor economic benefit \Box Work outside \Box Labour shortage \Box Aged \Box Others									
In the past 5 years (around	Rent out		□Cropland □Grassland □Forest land □				□Good □Medium □Bad				□Good benefits □ □Enjoy work on land □Enough labour □To raise livestock	
2010- 2016)	Do you want to rent out	Yes	□Cropland □Grassland □Forest land □				□Good □Medium □Bad				□Good benefits □ □Enjoy work on land □Enough labour □To raise livestock	
	more?	No	Why? \Box Poor economic benefit \Box Work outside \Box Labour shortage \Box Aged \Box Others									
	Plan to abandon?	Yes	□Cropland □Grassland □Forest land □				□Good □Medium □Bad	-			□Good benefits □ □Enjoy work on land □Enough labour □To raise livestock	
		No	<i>Why?</i> \Box Land is basic insurance \Box No other work chance \Box Others									
20 years ago (1995)	Rent		□Cropland □Grassland □Forest land □				□Good □Medium □Bad	-			□Good benefits □ □Enjoy work on land □Enough labour □To raise livestock	
	Rent out		□Cropland □Grassland □Forest land □				□Good □Medium □Bad				□Good benefits □ □Enjoy work on land □Enough labour □To raise livestock	

2. Abandoned farmland:

Under which conditions would you abandon your farmland?

Condition			Reasons	Condition	Reasons	
	□Good			-Overtity of leborary	□many (>3)	
□Quality of land	l⊐Medium			Quantity of laborers	\Box normal (around 2)	
	□Bad				□few (<=1)	
	□Has nothing to do with quality			□Job opportunity	□around village	
	Distance	□< 1 kilometer		[□have nothing to do with job	□in town	
	[□has nothing to do	□1-5 kilometer		opportunity]	□beyond town	
	with distance]	$\Box > 5$ kilometer		Cost on land (ag. fortilization)	□increased to double	
	Resistance	□cross-mountain		$\Box Cost on faile (eg. fertilization)$	<i>□increased to triple</i>	
	[□has nothing to do with resistance]	□cross-river		cost]	□increased more than triple	
□Accessibility	Road	□no road		□Subsidy	□15 yuan/mu per year	
	[□have nothing to do	□road could walk on		[□have nothing to do with the	□10 yuan/mu per year	
	with road]	□road could drive on		subsidy]	□none	
	Gradient [□has nothing to do with gradient]	□< 5°		□Price (set corn as an example)	□2 yuan per kilogram	
		□5°-15°		[□have nothing to do with the	□1.5 yuan per kilogram	
		□15°-25°		price]	□1 yuan per kilogram	
		□> 25°		□Production (set corn as an	□< 800 kilogram/mu	
		□frequently(1-2/year)		example)	□800-1400 kilogram/mu	
□Drought freque [□have nothing	ency to do with drought]	□normal (3-5years once)		[□have nothing to do with production]	□> 1400 kilogram/mu	
		□few (10 years once)				
Wetenlessing	6	□frequently(1-2/year)				
□ waterlogging 1	trequency	□normal (3-5years once)				
[□have nothing to do with waterlogging]		□few (10 years once)				
		□if all neighbours choose to				
□Whether decisions are impacted by		\Box if majority (3/4) neighbours choose to				
neighbours?		□half of neighbours choose to]			
[□have nothing	to do with neighbours]	\Box if minority (1/4) neighbours choose to				
		none				