

Agreements, Plans, Negotiations and Positions

► Major Early Plans on the Jordan River

One of the first plans related to the JR was the **Franghia Plan** in 1913, which proposed the use of the JR system for irrigation and electricity. Sponsored by the Ottoman Empire, the plan floundered with the fall of the Empire after WWI. In 1944, the United States recommended the **Lowdermilk Plan**, which proposed the irrigation of the Negev Desert with the waters of the Jordan and Litani rivers, and the refilling of the Dead Sea through a canal from the Mediterranean Sea. The plan was abandoned following the change of circumstances in the JR Basin after WWII with the creation of Israel and the influx of large numbers of refugees.

The aforementioned efforts to reallocate the JR waters were never ratified. In 1953 US special envoy to the ME, Ambassador Eric Johnston, proposed an allocation scheme based on the previous proposals. **Johnston's Jordan Valley Plan** is the product of his negotiating with representatives of Israel, Lebanon, Syria and Jordan for 24 months, which finally led in 1955 to a unified plan, that in his view, reconciled the demands of all the riparians. The plan was never adopted or ratified, partly because the Arab states (especially Jordan) did not need a comprehensive water development program that directly involved Israel in order to achieve their immediate development goals. Also, the Arabs did not agree to the criteria that were used for dividing the shares among the parties.

Table 5: Unified (Johnston) Plan 1953-1955: Water Allocations to Riparians of the Jordan River System

	Lebanon	Syria	Jordan	Israel	Total
Hasbani	35				35
Banias		20		20	
Jordan (main stream)		22	100	375	497
Yarmuk		90	377	25	492
Side wadis			243	243	
Total Unified Plan	35	132	720	400	1,287

Source: Naff and Matson (1984) found in www.unu.edu/unupress/unupbooks/80859e/80859E06.htm

► Israeli Unilateral Measures on the Jordan River

In 1951, Israel publicized its All-Israel Plan, based on the Lowdermilk proposals, which included the draining of the Huleh Lake and swamps, the diversion of the northern JR and the construction of a carrier to the coastal plain and the Negev. In the same year, Israel completed the drainage of the Huleh swamps and reclaimed land and water on its side of the JR.

Israel's primary unilateral effort to manage its water resources resulted in the National Water Carrier ("Carrier"), which has been fully operational since 1964, and is designed to bring water from the less arid north to the arid southern areas of Israel. It begins by diverting water from the JR above the northwest corner of Lake Tabariya. The water is eventually pumped from the 213 meters below sea level of Lake Tabariya to heights of over 150 meters above sea level. The Carrier includes 200 km of open canals, tunnels and pipes. Although planned to carry 320 mcm of water, the Carrier transported between 420-450 mcm each year in the 1980s. The Carrier is a vital managerial system in Israel and is interconnected with several other regional water management plans.



Israeli National Water Carrier

► Provisions in the Framework of the Middle East Peace Process

■ The Declaration of Principles (DoP), Washington, DC, 13 September 1993

Annex III of the DoP established an institutional mechanism, the Israeli-Palestinian "Committee for Economic Cooperation," focusing on various areas including water. One of the anticipated outcomes was a "Water Development Program" prepared by experts from both sides which would set up a way for the parties to cooperate in the management of water resources in the WBGs and would encourage the preparation of proposals, studies and plans on water rights and utilization for each party. On the regional level the two sides agreed to cooperate in using the Dead Sea area and working on projects such as a Mediterranean Sea (Gaza)-Dead Sea Canal and regional desalination plants.

The DoP is the only official document in which both parties agreed to undertake studies and prepare proposals on the **equitable utilization** of joint resources to be implemented during and beyond the Interim Agreement. It was considered the benchmark for future negotiations.