Abstract
Simultaneous speech translation (SimulST) is a challenging task aiming to translate streaming speech before the complete input is observed. A SimulST system generally includes two components: the pre-decision that aggregates the speech information and the policy that decides to read or write. While recent works had proposed various strategies to improve the pre-decision, they mainly adopt the fixed wait-k policy, leaving the adaptive policies rarely explored. This paper proposes to model the adaptive policy by adapting the Continuous Integrate-and-Fire (CIF). Compared with monotonous multihead attention (MMA), our method has the advantage of simpler computation, superior quality at low latency, and better generalization to long utterances. We conduct experiments on the MuST-C V2 dataset and show the effectiveness of our approach.
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1. Introduction
Simultaneous speech translation is a task that performs translation in a streaming fashion. It requires producing the translation of partial input before the complete input is observed. It is challenging because it needs to take reordering between languages into account. To achieve the best trade-off between latency and quality, a simultaneous translation system needs to decide whether to read more input or write a new token at each timestep. This decision can follow either a fixed policy [1] or a flexible (adaptive) policy [2]. Typically, a simultaneous machine translation (SimulMT) system is cascaded with a streaming speech recognition (ASR) to form practical applications such as international conferences.

End-to-end simultaneous speech translation (SimulST) aims to directly perform simultaneous translation on the speech input. Compared to cascaded SimulMT, end-to-end methods avoid error propagation [3, 4] and are faster thanks to a unified model. However, it faces more challenges like acoustically ambiguous inputs or variable speech rates. Because speech input may be too fine-grained for policies to be learned, the pre-decision was introduced [5]. The pre-decision segments the speech based on fixed chunks (fixed) or word boundaries (flexible), before read-write policies are applied. Most research on SimulST improves the speech encoding or the pre-decision, while adopting the fixed policy [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. To our best knowledge, the only exceptions are the monotonous multihead attention (MMA) with pre-decision [12, 5], or the Cross Attention Augmented Transducer (CAAT) [13].

In this paper, we explore the Continuous Integrate-and-Fire (CIF) [14] for another adaptive policy (Figure 1). Similar to connectionist temporal classification (CTC) [15] or the MMA, the CIF is also a monotonic alignment method. It has several advantages over the MMA. During training, the MMA marginalizes out all alignments at each decoder layer. Besides, gradient clipping, denominator clipping and log-space conversion are essential to alleviate numerical instability [16]. The CIF, on the other hand, only computes a single alignment using addition and weighted sum, and is thus faster and more stable. Furthermore, in our experiments, the CIF not only exhibits better quality in low latency, but also generalizes better to long utterances. We argue that being able to deal with longer utterances is an important advantage because, in practice, the input speech can be arbitrarily long, and sentence boundary is often unavailable. On the other hand, the quality at low latency is more critical for streaming because a second-pass model or even an offline model may be more appropriate for higher latency.

To adapt the CIF to SimulST, we proposed two modifications. The first is extending the quantity loss [14] to a token-level objective. It leverages the forced alignment from an auxiliary CTC prediction head. The other is allowing the decoder to attend to past CIF integration states for the sake of explicit reordering. We test our result on MuST-C V2 [17] test set, as well as three synthetic long utterance set constructed from it. Our contributions are summarized below:

- We proposed a new approach to model the adaptive policy in SimulST.
- The proposed method is fast, stable, performs better at low latency, and generalizes better to long utterances.

![Figure 1: The illustration of the adaptive policy learned by the CIF module. From top to bottom: the transcription, the speech with force alignment and the translation read-write policy. Red arrows are CIF integrations and correspond to read actions. Blue arrows are CIF firings and correspond to write actions.](image-url)
2. Related Works

2.1. Continuous Integrate-and-Fire

The CIF was proposed for ASR as an online model to learn the precise acoustic boundaries [14]. It is faster and more robust to long or noisy utterances during inference [18] than the standard Transformer [19]. Since it integrates longer sequences into shorter ones, the CIF can bridge the gap between pre-trained acoustic and linguistic representations [20]. Applied to Simult, it can act as pre-decision to locate acoustic boundaries, so that fixed policies can be applied [21]. Our work differs from these works in that we leverage CIF to learn the adaptive policy of Simult. We do not use the transcription when training translation models.

2.2. End-to-End Simultaneous Speech Translation

In recent years, several works had focused on improving the speech encoding and the pre-decision process. [9] studied the encoding and segmentation strategies for ULSTM encoder. Simult [7] used CTC for pre-decision, and used multi-task learning and knowledge distillation to improve Simult. [5] introduced fixed pre-decision and flexible pre-decision. [8] explored block processing for the streaming encoder. [9] used an ASR module as flexible pre-decision. RealTran [10] used CTC for pre-decision, and semantic encoder to improve encoding. UnitST [11] used self-supervised speech encoder, CIF as pre-decision, and a semantic encoder as well. All these works adopted the wait-k or similar fixed policies.

On the other hand, adaptive policies have rarely been explored for speech. [3] explored MMA for its decoder. CAAT [13] augmented the RNN-T [21] with cross-attention to have a more complex joiner capable of reordering. Our work introduces a new adaptive policy learned using the CIF. We compare our results with that of the MMA.

3. Method

Figure 2 demonstrates the overall architecture of our model. We describe each component below.

3.1. Streaming Speech Encoder

The speech encoder takes a sequence of speech features \( X_1, \cdots, X_T \) as input, and produces a sequence of encoder states \( h_1, h_2, \cdots, h_T \). It consists of a feature extractor, a positional encoding and a stack of Emformer [22] layers. We use the feature extractor from the fairseq-SST toolkit [23]. For positional encoding, we use a temporal convolution to capture relative positional information [24]. The Emformer is a block processing Transformer suitable for streaming. Each block has access to its main context, left context, right context and a memory bank. During training, the effect of block processing is achieved by using an attention mask and right-context hard copy trick. During inference, the input will be processed block by block with overlapping context.

3.2. CIF Module

In this work, the CIF learns when to output a target token. Suppose the target sequence is \( y_1, y_T \). At each encoder step \( i \in [1, U] \), we first use a weight prediction network to predict \( \alpha_i \). Then, the CIF caches \( h_i \) and \( \alpha_i \) in the accumulation buffers \( B_h \) and \( B_\alpha \), respectively. At this point, two possible things can occur. If the current accumulated weight \( \sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}} k \) has not reach the threshold \( \beta \), the CIF simply proceed to the next step \( i + 1 \). Otherwise, it means a boundary is located. The CIF divides \( \alpha_i \) into \( \alpha_{i,1} \) and \( \alpha_{i,2} \). The \( \alpha_{i,1} \) is kept in \( B_\alpha \), such that \( B_\alpha \) forms a distribution that sums to \( 1 \). The \( \alpha_{i,2} \) (and a copy of \( h_i \)) is carried over to the next integration. Then, CIF computes a weighted sum of \( B_h \) using weights \( B_\alpha \) to produce the integrated embeddings \( c_j \). Finally, \( c_j \) is fired to the decoder to be processed for the prediction of \( y_j \). The above process is performed till the end of encoder states (Figure 2).

The weight prediction network is composed of a temporal convolution, followed by layer normalization [25], a non-linear activation, dropout, a fully connected layer with one output and a sigmoid activation. We found that it generalizes better if we stop gradient flowing from the weight prediction network back into the encoder.

During training, the CIF generally does not fire exactly the same times as the target length \( T \). This brings difficulties to the cross-entropy objective. To make sure the sequences \( (c_j), (y_j) \) match in length, two strategies were proposed by [14]. First of all, before integration, the scaling strategy normalizes the weight of each timestep such that they would sum to \( T \):

\[
\alpha_i' = \alpha_i \cdot \frac{T}{\sum_{i=1}^T \alpha_i} \quad (1)
\]

Next, a L2 quantity loss encourages the weights to sum to \( T \):

\[
L_{qua} = \left\| T - \sum_{i=1}^T \alpha_i \right\|_2 \quad (2)
\]

These strategies are only used during training but not inference.

3.3. Monotonic Decoder

Our decoder follows the original autoregressive Transformer decoder, except for the cross-attention. We design two variant, one with position-wise fusion, and another with infinite lookback attention [2].
3.3.1. Position-wise Fusion

Because the number of integrated embeddings $c_j$ is the same as the decoder length $T$, we replace the cross-attention in each layer with a position-wise fusion described below:

$$\text{Fusion}(c_j, s_j) = W_c f_{act}(W_c c_j + W_s s_j + b),$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $s_j$ is the decoder hidden state after self-attention. $W_c$, $W_s$, $W_r$ are trainable weight matrices and $b$ is a bias vector. $f_{act}$ is any non-linear activation. While fusion operations are the same across different positions, they use different parameters from layer to layer. We refer to this model as CIF-F.

3.3.2. Infinite Lookback Attention (ILA)

The ILA improves monotonous models for SimulST thanks to its ability to explicitly reorder [2, 13]. Thus, we also explore having the decoder attend to past integrated embeddings. In this variant, the cross-attention is retained, but the $j$-th decoder state can only attend to integrated embedding $c_k$ if $k \leq j$. We refer to this model as CIF-IL.

3.4. Token-level Quality Loss

Preliminary experiments show that directly applying the CIF-F to SimulST has limitations. In particular, the validation $L_{qua}$ in [2] increases while the training value decreases. We suspect this is because optimizing $L_{qua}$ at the sequence-level provides a weak training signal for alignment. Since the CTC loss often accompanies the CIF [14, 18, 20], this inspired us to leverage its ability to explicitly reorder [2, 13]. Thus, we also explore using the CTC forward-backward algorithm to obtain the forced alignment. The sequence $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_T \in \{\phi, y_1, \ldots, y_T\}$ monotonically align each encoder position to a target position or a blank ($\phi$). Then, we find boundaries by looking for $i$ such that $a_i \neq \phi$ and $a_i \neq a_{i+1}$. For each boundary position $i$, we further define its target length as $t_i = j$, where $j$ is the index of its aligned token $y_j$ (i.e. $a_i = y_j$). Finally, we define a token-level quality loss:

$$L_{qua}(i) = \begin{cases} ||t_i - \sum_{k=1}^{i} a_k||_2, & \text{if } i \text{ is boundary} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (4)

$$L_{qua} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^{T} L_{qua}(i)$$ \hspace{1cm} (5)

The CIF-IL has access to past integrated embeddings, so the alignment is easier to learn. We observe little difference between using [5] and [2] when training CIF-IL, so [2] is used.

3.5. Latency Loss

To provide a latency-quality trade-off, we add latency training with the Differentiable Average Lagging (DAL) [2]. To do so, we first need to define the expected delay $d(y_j)$ of a target token $y_j$, which is the expected source length processed before $y_j$ is predicted. Suppose that $y_j$ is predicted using $c_j$, which is a weighted sum by weights $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_T$, then we define

$$d(y_j) = \sum_{k=1}^{T} \alpha_k \cdot k.$$ \hspace{1cm} (6)

The latency loss $L_{lat}$ is the DAL computed with the expected delays. Due to space limitation, we refer the readers to [2] for details on latency training.

3.6. Final objective

The final objective is described by:

$$\mathcal{L} = L_{ce} + \lambda_{ctc}L_{ctc} + \lambda_{qua}L_{qua} + \lambda_{lat}L_{lat},$$ \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $L_{ce}$ is the standard cross-entropy loss. $\lambda_{ctc} = 0.3$, $\lambda_{qua} = 1.0$ for all experiments, and $\lambda_{lat} \in \{0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0\}$ for both CIF-F and CIF-IL.

4. Experimental Setup

We conduct experiments on the English-German (En-De) portion of MuST-C V2 [13]. The V2 release by IWSLT 2021 [25] contains 435 hours of speech and 249k sentence pairs. We use the pre-processing pipeline from fairseq-S2T [23]. Input is transformed to 80 dimensional log-mel filter bank features using 25ms window and 10ms shift. We keep training examples within 5 to 3000 frames. SpecAugment [27] with the LB policy is applied. SentencePiece [28] is used to generate subword vocabulary with 4096 tokens for each language pairs. We tune the performance using the dev set, and report results on the tst-COMMON set.

The feature extractor has 2 convolution layers with kernel size 5, stride 2, and hidden dimension 256. The positional encoding has kernel size 64, group size 16 and stride 1. The Emformer encoder has 12 layers and the decoder has 6 layers. The models have 4 attention heads, $d_{model} = 256$ and $d_{FFN} = 2048$. Dropout is set to 0.1 for activations and attentions, and 0.3 for others. We follow [8] and set the Emformer main context to 640 ms, right context to 320 ms, memory bank to 5. We increase the left context to 1280 ms following [22]. The convolution in the CTF weight prediction has kernel size 3 and stride 1. The CIF threshold $\beta = 1$ during training, and is individually tuned for each model on the dev set during inference. Tail handling [14] uses $\beta/2$. To enable streaming, all the convolution layers are causal. The 320 ms right context of the Emformer is the only look-ahead. The MMA models use fixed pre-decision ratio 8 (i.e. 320 ms). Latency weight is $\lambda_{var} \in \{0.02, 0.04, 0.06, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4\}$, and $\lambda_{avg} = 0$ for MMA-H and $\lambda_{var} = \lambda_{lat}$ for MMA-IL. Label smoothing [29] of 0.1 is applied. We use inverse square root schedule and 4000 warm-up steps for the optimizer. The max learning rate is 1e-4 for MMA-H [24] and 1e-3 for others. We use up to 4 V100 GPUs and gradient accumulation to achieve an effective batch size of 160k frames. Gradient norm are clipped at 10, and weight decay is set to 1e-6. We follow [5] to first train without latency loss for 150K steps, then finetune with various latency weights for another 50K steps. We average the 5 checkpoints with best latency for evaluation. To ease optimization, all models use pre-trained encoder and sequence-level knowledge distillation (Seq-KD) [30]. Specifically, the encoders are initialized from an ASR model pre-trained under the joint CTC and cross-entropy loss for 300K steps. For Seq-KD we first train a NMT model on the sentence pairs, then we use beam search with width 5 to decode the Seq-KD set, which is used as the new training data for ST.

We use SimulEval [31] to compute speech versions of widely adopted latency metrics including Average Proportion (AP) [32], Average Lagging (AL) [11] and Differentiable Average Lagging (DAL) [33]. We report case-sensitive detokenized BLEU using SacreBLEU [34].

---

https://ict.fbk.eu/must-c/

*training diverges with 1e-3 due to instability.*

*BLEU+case.mixed+numrefs.1+smooth.exp+tok.13a+version.1.5.1*
5. Results

5.1. Comparison on the original test set

Figure 3 shows the result on tst-COMMON. The performance of MMA-IL at low latency appears better with AL. It is shown by examples that AL may be exploited by adaptive policy models. Interestingly, the MMA-H and the MMA-IL have drastically different performance in SimulST, despite being comparable in SimulMT. This may be due to the variable speech rate that is better handled by the ILA. Compared with MMA-H, both CIF-F and CIF-IL have lower latency at the same quality, and CIF-IL can achieve better quality. Compared with MMA-IL, the proposed models have superior quality at lower latency (DAL ≤ 2000 or AP ≤ 0.75), but falls short at higher latency. This shows that the CIF is a better choice in medium-low latency, while MMA-IL is better if high latency is tolerable.

Table 1: Performance comparison on long utterance sets with L ∈ {0, 20, 40, 60}. L = 0 is the original setting. The top 4 rows show settings with best BLEU. The bottom 4 rows show settings with similar BLEU. DAL is measured in seconds here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>L=0</th>
<th>L=20</th>
<th>L=40</th>
<th>L=60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMA-H</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>18.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMA-IL</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>18.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIF-F</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>18.16</td>
<td>18.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIF-IL</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>25.22</td>
<td>18.16</td>
<td>18.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLEU DAL</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Time comparison. total: the total time from the second epoch to 50k steps. step: the wall clock time of each step. The DAL-CA is computed on an Intel Xeon E5-2620 CPU using a single core, and is averaged over 3 evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>total (hr)</th>
<th>step (ms)</th>
<th>DAL (ms)</th>
<th>DAL-CA (ms)</th>
<th>∆</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMA-H</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2981</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMA-IL</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2086</td>
<td>3158</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIF-F</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>2770</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIF-IL</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Comparison on long utterances

We create synthetic long utterances by concatenating utterances from the same speaker in tst-COMMON, such that each example is at least L seconds long. The content of the speech and reference remain the same. For a fair comparison, we evaluate 2 models from each method, one with the best BLEU, and the other with a BLEU close to 18.5. From Table 1 we see that for MMA, both the latency and quality deteriorate rapidly as the utterance length increases. When the input is a minutes long, the MMA-IL's latency is over 21 seconds and BLEU is less than 6. In contrast, the latency and quality of CIF decline more gently. Particularly, CIF-F is the most robust, remaining at about 14.7 BLEU in the longest setting. For MMA, multiple heads operate independently, and there are no mechanism preventing heads from being stuck at early timesteps. For MMA-IL and CIF-IL, relying on the ILA have the risk of distracting the decoder with earlier, irrelevant inputs. All these problems manifest as the input speech duration increases.

5.3. Comparison on computation time

We compare the training and inference time of models with similar DAL in Table 2. The computation per token (∆) is the difference between the DAL and the computation aware DAL (DAL-CA). Evidently, the CIF take much less time to train. During inference, the CIF also have an advantage of up to 302 ms per token over the MMA. This advantage may further increase when testing on computation-limited hardware such as edge devices.

6. Conclusion

We applied the CIF mechanism to the problem of adaptive policy learning in SimulST. We show that despite its simplicity, the CIF achieved decent latency-quality trade off. We verified that the CIF learns useful adaptive policy, where it speeds up easier predictions and delays harder ones. Compared with MMA, our method has the advantages of faster computation, superior quality at low latency, and better generalization to long utterances. We recommend future work on SimulST to take a closer look at long utterance as it is closer to practical application.
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