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1. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spin-lattice and spin-spin relaxation temperature dependences for the perdeuterated propene- $\boldsymbol{d}_{6}$.


Figure S1. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spin relaxation times $T_{1}(0)$ and $T_{2}(\square)$ of propene $-d_{6}$ as a function of the temperature. Relaxation of the unresolved signal is shown in green, of the $\mathrm{CD}_{3}$ group is in red, and the relaxation of the $\mathrm{CD} / \mathrm{CD}_{2}$ groups (unresolved signal) is in yellow.

## 2. Modeling of spin relaxation

To understand the detailed mechanism of rotations and their kinetic parameters (the activations barriers and rate constants), a detailed fitting analysis of the ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spin relaxation within experimentally studied temperature range is to be performed. Our homemade FORTRAN simulation routines are based on the general formalism proposed by Abragam ${ }^{1}$ and developed in details by Spiess ${ }^{2}$ and others ${ }^{3-6}$.

Spin relaxation times $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$ are generally anisotropic and depend on the observation angles $\theta$ and $\varphi$ in the powder pattern. They are given by the usual formula: ${ }^{2}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1}{T_{1}}=\frac{3}{4} \pi^{2} Q_{0}^{2}\left(J_{1}\left(\omega_{0}\right)+4 J_{2}\left(2 \omega_{0}\right)\right)  \tag{1}\\
& \frac{1}{T_{2}}=\frac{3}{8} \pi^{2} Q_{0}^{2}\left(3 J_{0}(0)+5 J_{1}\left(\omega_{0}\right)+2 J_{2}\left(2 \omega_{0}\right)\right), \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

where the spectral density function $J_{m}(\omega)$ for the chosen model of the molecule motion is defined by the expression:

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{m}(\omega)=2 \sum_{a, b=-2}^{2} D_{a, q}\left(\Omega_{L}\right)^{*} D_{b, q}\left(\Omega_{L}\right) \otimes G_{0, a \mid 0, b}(\omega), \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{c, a \mid d, b}(\omega)=\sum_{l, k, n=1}^{N} D_{c, a}^{l}\left(\Omega_{l}\right)^{*} D_{d, b}^{k}\left(\Omega_{k}\right) p_{e q}(l) V_{l, n}\left(\frac{-\lambda_{n}}{\lambda_{n}^{2}+\omega^{2}}\right) V_{n, k}^{-1} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $\Omega_{L}$ are the observation angles $\theta$ and $\varphi$, which connect the molecular frame with the laboratory frame; $\Omega_{k}$ are the Euler angles which connect the molecular frame with the $k$-th distinct position of the $C-D$ bond within the assumed geometry of the jump model; $V_{l, n}$ is a matrix composed by Eigen vectors of kinetic matrix K and $\lambda_{n}$ are its Eigen values; N is the number of distinct jump-sites.

If one or multiple isotropic motions are present the corresponding correlation function is no longer dependent from the polar angles and the resulting function is simply a tensor multiplication of correlation functions for distinct motional modes:

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{m}(\omega)=2 \sum_{a, b=-2}^{2} D_{a, q}\left(\Omega_{L}\right)^{*} D_{b, q}\left(\Omega_{L}\right) \otimes G_{c, a \mid d, b}^{1}(\omega) \otimes G_{0, c \mid 0, d}^{2}(\omega) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Once the individual motional model is defined, the exchange between the states I and II is modeled as standard chemical exchange of the individual relaxation rates ( $T_{1}{ }^{\mathbf{I}}$ and $T_{1}{ }^{\mathbf{I I}}$ ) and ( $T_{2}{ }^{\mathbf{I}}$ and $T_{2}{ }^{\text {II }}$ ) with respective populations and the exchange rate. The resulting effective relaxation times were directly computed from the Bloch's equations:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d}{d t}\binom{M_{Z}^{I}}{M_{Z}^{I I}}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
-\frac{1}{T_{1}^{I}}-K_{e q} \cdot k_{e x} & K_{e q} \cdot k_{e x} \\
k_{e x} & -\frac{1}{T_{1}^{I I}}-k_{e x}
\end{array}\right)\binom{M_{Z}^{I}}{M_{Z}^{I}}  \tag{6}\\
& \frac{d}{d t}\binom{M_{\perp}^{I}}{M_{\perp}^{I I}}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
-\frac{1}{T_{2}^{I}}-K_{e q} \cdot k_{e x} & K_{e q} \cdot k_{e x} \\
k_{e x} & -\frac{1}{T_{2}^{I I}-k_{e x}}
\end{array}\right)\binom{M_{\perp}^{I}}{M_{\perp}^{I I}} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

where $M_{Z}{ }^{\mathbf{I}}$ and $M_{\perp}{ }^{\mathbf{I}}$ are the longitudinal and transverse magnetization of state $\mathbf{I}$ and $M_{Z}{ }^{\mathbf{I I}}$ and $M_{\perp}{ }^{\mathbf{I I}}$ are corresponding magnetization of state II, $k_{\text {ex }}$ is the exchange rate, $K_{e q}=p_{I I} / p_{I}$ is the equilibrium constant. The effective relaxation $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$ are then determined by numerical calculation as Eigenvalues of the exchange matrices. ${ }^{7}$ The net longitudal magnetization decays in biexponential manner with rates equal to eigenvalues of the matrix. Both eigenvalues are negative. One eigenvalue has large magnitude and equal to the $\lambda_{\max }=-k_{e x}\left(K_{e q}+1\right)$ in the fast
exchange limit. The other eigenvalue ${ }^{\lambda_{\text {min }}}$ has low magnitude and contains information about the molecular mobility even in the fast limit. Since $e^{-\lambda_{\max }{ }^{t}}$ decays too fast to be observed in the experiment, the final relaxation rate is chosen as the $\lambda_{\text {min }}$.

## 3. Synthesis and characterization of the ZIF-8

The material was the same used earlier in ref. ${ }^{8}$ for benzene mobility characterization in ZIF-8. It was synthesized following the route reported by Cravillon et al. ${ }^{9}$ and Keser Demir et al. ${ }^{10}$ A solution of the $\mathrm{Zn}\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2} \cdot 6 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( 2.3 g , Sigma-Aldrich) in 75 mL of MeOH was quickly poured into a solution of $2-\mathrm{miM}(5 \mathrm{~g})$ in 75 mL of MeOH under stirring at room temperature with pH mediated by NaOH . After 1 h the nanoparticles were separated from the mother solution by centrifugation. The resulting white crystals were washed twice by 100 mL of deionized water ( 18 h in total) and twice by 100 mL of MeOH ( 24 h in total). The resulting product was dried under a flush of nitrogen at room temperature and activated at high vacuum at 373 K for 10 h .

The XRD analysis of the activated material (Figure S2) revealed a pattern matching with previously reported data ${ }^{9}$, ${ }^{10}$. The X-Ray diffraction patterns were collected on the Siemens D500 instrument using $\mathrm{CuK} \alpha$ radiation. The $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ adsorption measurement of the activated at 423 K material has shown a BET surface area of $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{BET}} \sim 1350 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{g}$ (Figures S3,S4).


Figure S2. XRD pattern of the activated ZIF-8 material. The XRD is the typical fingerprint of ZIF-8 structure.


Figure S3. Nitrogen adsorption isotherm for the activated ZIF-8.


Figure S4. Initial adsorption step affords a good linear approximation using the BET model yielding a surface area of $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{BET}} \sim 1350 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{g}$.

Scanning Electron Microscopy showed regular shaped crystals of uniform distribution.


Figure S5. SEM image of the synthesized ZIF-8 particles. The images were taken on a JEOL JSM-6700F instrument (acceleration voltage $=5 \mathrm{kV}$, current $=10 \mu \mathrm{~A}$ ).
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