

ESPNET-EZ: PYTHON-ONLY ESPNET FOR EASY FINE-TUNING AND INTEGRATION

Masao Someki^{*1}, Kwanghee Choi^{*1}, Siddhant Arora¹, William Chen¹, Samuele Cornell¹,
Jionghao Han¹, Yifan Peng¹, Jiatong Shi¹, Vaibhav Srivastav², Shinji Watanabe¹

¹Carnegie Mellon University, USA ²Hugging Face, USA

ABSTRACT

We introduce ESPnet-EZ, an extension of the open-source speech processing toolkit ESPnet, aimed at quick and easy development of speech models. ESPnet-EZ focuses on two major aspects: (i) easy fine-tuning and inference of existing ESPnet models on various tasks and (ii) easy integration with popular deep neural network frameworks such as PyTorch-Lightning, Hugging Face transformers and datasets, and Lhotse. By replacing ESPnet design choices inherited from Kaldi with a Python-only, Bash-free interface, we dramatically reduce the effort required to build, debug, and use a new model. For example, to fine-tune a speech foundation model, ESPnet-EZ, compared to ESPnet, reduces the number of newly written code by 2.7x and the amount of dependent code by 6.7x while dramatically reducing the Bash script dependencies. The codebase of ESPnet-EZ is publicly available.¹

Index Terms— open-source toolkit, speech foundation model

1. INTRODUCTION

The Kaldi automatic speech recognition (ASR) toolkit [1] is one of the most successful open-source efforts in speech processing. One of the key aspects of Kaldi’s design comes from the *recipe structure*. Each recipe provides a fully reproducible experiment, such as handling data preparation, model training, and evaluation. The various steps of the experiment often require the combination of various tools, including many Linux command-line executables and shell scripts/utilities. For example, `sox` is often used to handle various audio formats [2], `awk` for data wrangling [3], `make` for setting up development environments [4], and NIST SCTL for ASR evaluation [5]. Bash scripts are used to glue these tools together. One prominent example is the `run.sh` “main” script inside each recipe directory which calls all the necessary tools and scripts and runs the recipe end-to-end. This design enables easy reproduction and also encourages researchers to open-source their code, greatly benefiting the research community. Additionally, this approach offers scalability and extensibility by piggybacking on the computational efficiency and wide availability of such tools.

The ESPnet end-to-end speech processing toolkit [6] aims to expand Kaldi’s task coverage by supporting also other speech-related tasks [7–16]. However, it fundamentally retains its core design principles. In fact, similarly to Kaldi, ESPnet also focuses on end-to-end Bash script-based recipes to reproduce results from scratch. For example, various challenges that cover a wide array of tasks are being held based on ESPnet, such as multilingual automatic speech recognition (ASR) [17], robust speech recognition [18], and voice conversion [19]. Further, ESPnet provides




Fig. 1: Quantitative comparison of ESPnet and ESPnet-EZ. We compare the case of fine-tuning the OWSM model, a speech foundation model, for the automatic speech recognition task on a custom dataset. We use three criteria: (a) the number of new source code lines for the user to write and (b) the number of dependent source code files and (c) lines for each programming/scripting language. We observe that ESPnet-EZ significantly reduces engineering efforts compared to the original ESPnet. Newly written lines are reduced by 2.7x, and the dependent code lines and number of files are reduced by 6.7x and 6.6x, respectively. Further, ESPnet-EZ dramatically reduces the dependency on Bash and Perl.

several recipes for training various speech foundation models from scratch. These models are trained with large-scale data from various domains, requiring computational efficiency and parallelizability especially for data preparation and data loading. As such, these tasks are performed using many Kaldi tools, sacrificing ease of use for efficiency and training speed. ESPnet provides recipes for self-supervised speech models including HuBERT [20, 21] and wav2vec-U [14, 22], weakly-supervised speech models such as Whisper [23] via OWSM [24–26] and OWSM-CTC [27], as well as speech language models such as UniverSLU [28] and VoxLM [29].

These foundation models are becoming the de-facto standard in various speech processing tasks, such as ASR, text-to-speech (TTS), or spoken language understanding (SLU). They boast universal applicability on many tasks via fine-tuning, often achieving state-of-the-art performance, as demonstrated by benchmarks such as SUPERB [30], ML-SUPERB [31, 32], and SLUE [33]. Thus, many increasingly rely on fine-tuning such large-scale models for new tasks rather than training from scratch. Various methodologies can be used, such as full fine-tuning, parameter-efficient fine-tuning [34, 35], knowledge distillation [36], or prompting [37], making the approach less computationally demanding and more data-efficient.

In addition, recent open-source projects focus on further reducing engineering complexity by leveraging Python as the go-to language, unlike Kaldi and ESPnet, which still rely significantly on Bash and are thus arguably more difficult to debug. Linux executables were the easiest way to integrate various tools into a sin-

^{*} Equal contribution. Other authors are ordered by their surnames.

¹<https://github.com/espnet/espnet>

gle recipe. However, many of these tools now have valid Python alternatives, e.g. `sox` has `librosa` [38] or `torchaudio` [39], `make` can be replaced by Python package managers such as `pip` [40] or `conda` [41], and NIST SCTL by `TorchMetrics` [42] or `evaluate` [43]. Further, replacing these with Python scripts facilitates debugging, readability, and integration with other Python-based frameworks. Other libraries that follow this same design philosophy are: `transformers` [44], `asteroid` [45], `NeMo` [46], `SpeechBrain` [47], `WeNet` [48], and `S3PRL` [30].

In summary, `ESPnet` maintains a Bash script-based codebase for computational efficiency necessary for large-scale training. However, it increases the engineering cost for use cases where efficiency is less critical, such as fine-tuning or integrating with other Python-based frameworks. On the other hand, despite this drawback, `ESPnet` has the most comprehensive coverage of speech tasks compared to all other Python-based frameworks. These facts raise an interesting engineering question: *Why not both? Can we inherit the tasks of ESPnet while making it easier by replacing Bash with Python?*

To this end, we introduce `ESPnet-EZ`, an extension to `ESPnet`, designed to reduce engineering efforts by removing the Kaldi-style recipe structure. `ESPnet-EZ` inherits only the Python codebase of `ESPnet` and provides a Python-only modular interface. While `ESPnet` can focus on efficient training from scratch, `ESPnet-EZ` can provide ease of use via its Python-only codebase. As `ESPnet` and `ESPnet-EZ` share the same Python codebase, `ESPnet-EZ` has native support for all `ESPnet` downstream tasks: ASR, speaker verification, speaker diarization, speech enhancement, singing voice synthesis, text-to-speech, self-supervised learning, weakly supervised learning, language modeling, machine translation, speech-to-speech translation, speech-to-text translation, spoken language understanding, and unsupervised ASR.

Importantly, `ESPnet-EZ` removes all the Kaldi-style dependencies, avoiding shell-scripting altogether. For example, if the user wants to fine-tune a speech foundation model, the user can install `ESPnet` via a single line of code, *i.e.* `pip install espnet`, avoiding a lengthy and convoluted build procedure. Then, by importing the newly developed `ESPnet-EZ` library, the user can fine-tune the model with a Python-only trainer. `ESPnet-EZ` removes the need to reformat the dataset into a Kaldi-style dataset and write dozens of new lines of bash scripts. Moreover, we show it can be seamlessly integrated into existing machine learning Python frameworks, such as `PyTorch` [49], `PyTorch Lightning`, and `transformers Trainer` [44] and supports also different dataset frameworks, such as vanilla `PyTorch datasets`, `Huggingface datasets` [50], and `Lhotse` [51].

In the following, we first compare the original `ESPnet` and `ESPnet-EZ` by taking a closer look at the use case of fine-tuning a speech foundation model (Section 3). Then, we conduct a comparative analysis between `ESPnet` and `ESPnet-EZ` in Section 4. Finally, we demonstrate various advantages of `ESPnet-EZ`, such as wide task coverage (Section 5) and easy integration (Section 6). In summary, our work contributes the following:

1. Shows that `ESPnet-EZ` is far easier to use than `ESPnet` via quantitative, qualitative, and user feedback comparisons.
2. Demonstrates the wide task coverage of `ESPnet-EZ`.
3. Provides various `ESPnet-EZ` examples on smooth integration with existing deep learning frameworks.

2. DESIGN OF ESPNET-EZ

`ESPnet-EZ` aims to make `ESPnet` easier by removing Kaldi-style dependencies and exposing `ESPnet` core logic through a Python interface, thus allowing for fast development and easy integration with external toolkits. Figure 3 compares implicit and explicit call stacks of `ESPnet` and `ESPnet-EZ`. `ESPnet-EZ` offers a more streamlined and shallower stack, inspired by deep learning frameworks like `PyTorch Lightning` or `transformers`. It is built around two main modules: `Trainer` and `ESPNetEZDataset`, allowing flexibility through modularization.

2.1. Trainer

The core `espnet2.tasks` module is exposed to the user through a `Trainer` class interface. The interface is responsible for handling model training and fine-tuning for a particular task. It covers the two `ESPnet` recipe steps of collecting dataset statistics and training the model, where `ESPnet` and `ESPnet-EZ` share the same core logic. Currently, all 20 different speech tasks of `ESPnet` are natively supported, but, differently from this latter, it is also possible for the user to easily customize the `Trainer` for the application at hand.

2.2. ESPNetEZDataset

`ESPNetEZDataset` is responsible for interfacing the data formatting for feeding into the training loop. Original `ESPnet` feeds the data formatting specifics via the command-line interface, limiting the extensibility and requiring the user to follow the Kaldi-style dataset preparation. `ESPNetEZDataset` avoids the command-line interface via passing the Python function directly, removing the need of Bash script-based data processing steps altogether. `ESPNetEZDataset` is built on top of `Pytorch dataset` class, and thus is inherently flexible in supporting also other dataset modules that are built in the same way. Prominent examples are `Huggingface Datasets` and `Lhotse Datasets`, which can be easily integrated with `ESPnet-EZ`. We provide more examples in Section 6.

3. FINE-TUNING ON ESPNET AND ESPNET-EZ

Since a hands-on example is worth a million words, we outline the difference between `ESPnet` and `ESPnet-EZ` regarding engineering efforts for a simple ASR fine-tuning pipeline. The comparison is summarized in Figures 2 and 3.

3.1. Fine-tuning on ESPnet

Installation. For fine-tuning, the user has to create a new recipe in `ESPnet`. However, `ESPnet` has to be installed from source, which is a notoriously complex process due to its many dependencies. For example, for many recipes, one has to also download and build Kaldi beforehand. `ESPnet` provides a `Makefile` for installation. However, depending on various Python environment types, such as system default Python, virtual environment, or `conda` environment, there are different installation procedures that need to be followed accordingly. As these environments setups differ, builds often fail, requiring a lengthy debugging process through several build scripts. Furthermore, many recipes require additional recipe-specific dependencies, which need to be manually installed by running additional scripts in `tools/installers`. As we can see, the installation procedure is quite complex, especially compared to recent frameworks such as `SpeechBrain` or `transformers`.

	Installation	Write recipe	Model download	Dataset preparation	Model training
ESPnet	<pre>\$ git clone ... \$ cd espnet/tools \$./setup_anaconda.sh ... \$ make ...</pre>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generate a new recipe based on the template • Modify as needed 	<pre>./s2t.sh -- download_model espnet/owsm_v3.1 ...</pre>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dump all data to disk • Write code to correctly generate wav.scp, text, and utt2spk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ./s2t.sh stage 3, 10, and 11 • Custom edits in between required
ESPnet-EZ	<pre>\$ pip install espnet</pre>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need 	<pre>>>> model = S2T.from_pretrained("espnet/owsm_v3.1")</pre>	<pre>>>> data = { ... "speech": lambda d: ... librosa.load(...)[0], ... }</pre>	<pre>>>> trainer = ez.Trainer(...) >>> trainer.collect_stats() >>> trainer.train()</pre>

Fig. 2: Comparison of ESPnet and ESPnet-EZ on fine-tuning the model with a custom dataset. ESPnet has to go through dozens of shell scripts and custom modifications, whereas all the codes in ESPnet-EZ are within a single Python script.




Fig. 3: Comparison of ESPnet and ESPnet-EZ call stack of feeding the training data. ESPnet has to format the dataset into Kaldi-style and dump it to the local directories. So, it introduces an implicit dependency between the previous data preparation step and the training step. However, ESPnet-EZ avoids the stateful dependency via on-the-fly dataset preparation from Python-based data loaders.

Writing a new recipe. The typical ESPnet user leverages existing recipes to create a new fine-tuning recipe, such as OWSM and its `s2t1` pre-training recipe. Nevertheless, it still requires substantial effort if the custom data or new task does not exactly match the pre-training recipe. As such, in ESPnet the engineering effort for fine-tuning or training from scratch is largely the same.

Model download. To download the model for fine-tuning, the user has to use a shell script with specific parameters. For example, for OWSM, the user has to use the `s2t.sh` script inside the `s2st1` recipe. Within this script, recipe-dependent file-linking happens, which increases the complexity of utilizing the model if the user wants to only perform inference in a standalone way.

Dataset preparation. The dataset has to be prepared with Kaldi-compliant manifests, with specific filenames and rules to follow. The actual rules are not implicitly written as a Python class but as a Kaldi reference document, making the dataset preparation more challenging. Files such as `utt2spk` (mapping each utterance to the speaker) have to be taken care of, even if the user does not need additional functionalities (e.g. for blind speech separation or speech enhancement tasks). This further hinders usability when using outside dataset libraries. For example, to leverage Huggingface’s `datasets`, the user has to rewrite all the dataset rows into separate audio files. This means that another copy of the dataset in the disk is required, thus using extra storage. Furthermore, ad-

ditional data preparation steps after such manifest preparation are usually required. For example, in the case of OWSM’s `s2t1` recipe, the dataset has to go through additional formatting (Stage 3), filtering (Stage 4), and needs custom code for tokenization of the transcript. To go through these stages, the user has to feed dozens of hyperparameters to the `s2t.sh` script.

Model training and inference. For various batching strategies, ESPnet has to collect training data statistics (Stage 10). As the existing recipe is not designed for fine-tuning, the user additionally has to handle also this statistics collection step. Only after this latter step, based on the configuration file, the model can be fine-tuned. However, once the fine-tuning is over ESPnet actually lacks a straightforward way to run inference due to the data preparation steps needed. To prepare test data, the user has to go through the same lengthy procedure as done for the training data.

3.2. Fine-tuning on ESPnet-EZ

Installation. To install and use ESPnet-EZ, the user only needs a Python package manager, regardless of the environment. After activating a Python environment of any liking, typing `pip install espnet` will finish the installation process.

Recipe preparation. ESPnet-EZ does not depend on Kaldi-style recipes. Rather, it gives the user maximum freedom on how to use the ESPnet library for their own projects. In later sections, we provide easy ways to use the model as-is in the existing training code or train the model based on the ESPnet-EZ trainer functionality.

Model download. ESPnet-EZ removes the Bash scripts surrounding the `ESPnet-model-zoo`, which is previously introduced in ESPnet for easier model download. Hence, users can easily download and use the models via `from_pretrained` method within the Python codebase, similar to `asteroid` and `transformers`. Model download and management are performed under the hood, reducing engineering overhead.

Dataset preparation. As Kaldi-style dataset preparation is not anymore necessary (but still supported by ESPnet-EZ), various dataset frameworks can be easily integrated. As the ESPnet model receives PyTorch tensors, the user can easily build a shallow connector for existing dataset frameworks, such as vanilla PyTorch datasets, Huggingface `datasets`, and Lhotse, to feed the data into the model.

Model training and inference. Depending on the use case, the user can choose between leveraging the ESPnet-EZ Trainer or their custom trainer for training and inferencing the model. The ESPnet model is based on PyTorch, so it can be seamlessly integrated into existing frameworks, such as PyTorch Lightning. ESPnet already features a Python-friendly implementation of inference; therefore, we can directly incorporate the inference code with ESPnet-EZ scripts.




Fig. 4: Summary of user feedbacks on the benefits of using ESPnet-EZ or ESPnet.

4. COMPARING ESPNET AND ESPNET-EZ

4.1. Qualitative Comparison (High-level Summary)

As said, the current ESPnet codebase is optimized to be highly efficient in cluster environments by leveraging various shell scripts, making it well suited for large-scale training. However, as said, leveraging these foundation models in an off-the-shelf manner is equally important as it is arguably the mainstream approach for solving various speech tasks. Hence, ESPnet-EZ reduces the friction of leveraging existing models by reimplementing some of the shell-based codebases in a Python-only manner. Even though it introduces unavoidable computational overhead, it is negligible for smaller-scale training and fine-tuning (e.g. for Librispeech [52]).

4.2. Quantitative Comparison

We further quantify the differences by measuring engineering efforts in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. As an indirect metric, we measure the amount of code in various ways. We count the number of dependent files within the ESPnet codebase, the number of lines of the files, and the newly written number of lines. For the espnet, espnet2, and espnetez packages, we traverse through all the imported dependencies. For the command line tools for ESPnet, we count all codes in the script and pyscript directory within the recipe. We summarize the results in Figure 1. We can immediately observe that the amount of code is dramatically reduced. Furthermore, the language distribution becomes more Python-friendly, effectively removing Bash and Perl script dependencies altogether.

4.3. User Feedback Comparison

We gathered real-world feedback from the ESPnet users. We provided a Jupyter notebook demonstration similar to Section 5.3 and asked the users to list the pros and cons of using ESPnet-EZ relative to the full ESPnet toolkit. There were 21 respondents, encompassing undergraduate students who are new at speech research and graduate students who have already published multiple papers. Each respondent already had basic experience on ESPnet, where they went through the notebook demonstration of the ESPnet ASR recipe. We summarize the responses in Figure 4 and include all raw responses in the supplementary material. To obtain the summaries, we use a pre-trained Part-Of-Speech Tagger² to parse out adjectives. After grouping similar words, we counted each word that occurred more than once. The feedback to ESPnet-EZ was generally positive, as the respondents found that its similarities with transformers, make it easier and familiar to use. However,

²<https://github.com/explosion/spaCy>

some of the students also acknowledged that different features and customization may be relatively limited in ESPnet-EZ, and that fully leveraging the capabilities of ESPnet-EZ may still require deep understanding of the ESPnet package. The responses align well with our design decision: ESPnet-EZ handles the easier use cases, while ESPnet covers more challenging scenarios.

5. TASK COVERAGE OF ESPNET-EZ

In this section, we demonstrate the wide applicability of ESPnet-EZ to various tasks. In detail, we fine-tune the OWSM speech foundation model in various cases, such as (i) both the dataset and the task are seen during training (Sections 5.1 and 5.2), (ii) the dataset is seen but the task is unseen (Section 5.4), (iii) the dataset is unseen but the task is seen (Section 5.5), and (iv) both the dataset and the task are unseen (Sections 5.3 and 5.5). Specifically, we fine-tune the v3.1-ebf-base model³ [25] with 101M parameters. We also include the reported performance of state-of-the-art models for comparison on each task. All experiments are implemented via ESPnet-EZ, where we provide all the tutorials and codebase.⁴

5.1. Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR)

	dev (WER ↓)		test (WER ↓)	
	clean	other	clean	other
WavLM-Base+ [53]	N/A	N/A	4.6	10.1
WavLM-Large (with LM) [53]	N/A	N/A	2.1	4.0
Baseline	4.1	9.1	4.0	9.9
FT with ESPnet	4.5	9.8	4.8	10.3
FT with ESPnet-EZ	3.4	8.5	3.5	9.0
FT with ESPnet-EZ+ Lhotse	3.5	8.8	3.7	9.5
LoRA with ESPnet-EZ	3.4	8.4	3.6	8.8

Table 1: WER on Librispeech dev/test sets. **Baseline** represents the original model before fine-tuning. **FT** and **LoRA** indicates full-finetuning and PEFT results. **Lhotse** denotes online augmentation through Lhotse dataio functions.

Task definition. The model has to generate a transcription from a given speech input. We fine-tuned the model using a 100h train-clean-100 training subset of LibriSpeech [52]. For early stopping, we use dev-clean and dev-other subsets.

Baselines. We compare the performance of the OWSM model before fine-tuning, fine-tuned model by ESPnet or ESPnet-EZ. For the ground truth of ESPnet, we use the original input format with timestamps per the existing tutorials, while ESPnet-EZ uses the format with transcription only. For ESPnet-EZ, we additionally employ Lhotse for online data augmentation and Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [34] for parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT). Finally, we compare with the two state-of-the-art results from WavLM [53]. WavLM-Base+ (95M) has a similar parameter size as OWSM, and WavLM-Large (316M), with 3x the parameter size, uses shallow fusion with the transformer language model (LM).

Fine-tuning details. We conduct a grid search to find the optimal hyperparameter. We use the AdamW optimizer [54] with the learning rate grid of [2e-3, 1e-3, 5e-4, 1e-4] and the warm-up step grid of [5000, 15000]. The optimal configuration was the learning

³https://huggingface.co/espnet/owsm_v3.1-ebf-base

⁴<https://espnet.github.io/espnet/notebook/ESPnetEZ/>

rate of $1e-4$ and 15000 warm-up steps. The model was trained for 10 epochs. We use the same hyperparameter for both `ESPnet` and `ESPnet-EZ`. For LoRA, we use a rank of 8 and an alpha of 8. For augmentation, we use the speed, volume, and tempo augmentations for 30% of the data during training. Volume can be either 10% increased or decreased, and others can be 10% decreased.

Results. Table 1 demonstrates improvements in Word Error Rate (WER) of the fine-tuned model. Even though LibriSpeech is used during OWSM training, the transcription format is different. Hence, the model is likely to be fine-tuned towards the new format. However, `ESPnet` fine-tuning decreases performance, partially because the obtained hyperparameters being suboptimal in transcriptions that include timestamps. Also, LoRA is comparable to full fine-tuning, demonstrating the effectiveness of PEFT. However, online augmentation of `Lhotse` slightly degraded the performance, possibly due to Librispeech being relatively clean. Finally, fine-tuning OWSM shows superior performance over WavLM-Base+, which has a similar setting. The performance difference with WavLM-Large implies that scaling up to bigger OWSM models and shallow fusion with LM may further improve performance.

5.2. Speech Translation (ST)

	BLEU \uparrow	chrF \uparrow	TER \downarrow
Yan et al. [55]	29.2	N/A	N/A
Baseline	21.4	49.0	71.2
FT	23.3	49.7	57.5
LoRA	20.2	45.7	59.6
Cascaded	18.5	46.0	73.5

Table 2: Performance on MuST-C v2 English-to-German test set. **Baseline** represents the original model before fine-tuning. **FT** and **LoRA** indicates full-finetuning and PEFT results. For **Cascaded**, `whisper-tiny` and `t5-base` model is used.

Task definition. The model has to generate a translated text from speech from one language to another. OWSM model directly translates the audio input into the target language without generating the source language transcription. To evaluate fine-tuning performance on English-to-German translation, we used the MuST-C-V2 [56] dataset, which includes TED talks and their transcriptions. For evaluation, we use BiLingual Evaluation Understudy (BLEU) [57], CHaracter-level F-score (chrF) [58], and Translation Error Rate (TER) [59]. We use SacreBLEU [60] for valid set.

Baselines. Similar to Section 5.1, we compare the performance of OWSM before and after fine-tuning. We test full fine-tuning and LoRA. Also, we train a cascaded ST model, employing `whisper-tiny` [23] (transcribes speech into English) and the `t5-base` [61] (translates English to German) from `transformers`.

Fine-tuning details. We go through the same hyperparameter search process of Section 5.1. For LoRA, we use learning rate of $2e-3$. The prompt template for `whisper-tiny` is `translate English to German: <ASR result>`, obtained from the official website.⁵ We also format the first character in uppercase and the rest in lowercase. We compared with the state-of-the-art model [55] with ST-specific architecture design and 72M parameters.

Results. Table 2 shows that fine-tuning improves BLEU, while LoRA shows slight degradation. Nevertheless, LoRA improves TER by 11.6 points, indicating over the baseline. Cascaded ST performance was suboptimal, even though the total number of parameters

⁵<https://huggingface.co/openai/whisper-tiny>

(261M) is larger than OWSM. However, fine-tuned OWSM model was suboptimal relative to the state-of-the-art, where the encoder module of Yan et al. [55] is engineered to handle both source and target language features independently. This architectural distinction, absent in OWSM, facilitates the acquisition of target language information, potentially contributing to enhanced translation.

5.3. Spoken Language Understanding (SLU)

	Accuracy \uparrow
UniverSLU [28]	90.3%
FT	82.45%
LoRA	65.89%

Table 3: Accuracy of the intent classification task on SLURP dataset. **FT** and **LoRA** indicates full-finetuning and PEFT results.

Task definition. The model has to extract the meaning given the spoken content. For the SLU task, we evaluated the model’s performance using the SLURP [62] dataset, consisting of various in-home prompts for home assistants. We especially focus on the intent classification task, which is not included during OWSM training.

Baselines. As OWSM does not support the SLU task, we only test the two variants of fine-tuning: full fine-tuning and LoRA. We compare the results with UniverSLU [28], the state-of-the-art model that fine-tunes Whisper-medium (769M) [23] to 12 SLU tasks.

Fine-tuning details. We go through the same hyperparameter search of Section 5.1 and set the learning rate to $5e-4$. For warm-up, we choose 5k and 15k steps for full-finetuning and LoRA. We add a special task token `<intent>` to adapt the model to the new task.

Results. Table 2 shows that OWSM can be adapted to the unseen task with fine-tuning, even though it requires full fine-tuning for better performance. We observed that OWSM outputs several tokens to express intent, introducing errors while decoding the intent labels. Also, the model fitted to the training data too quickly. The empirical observations further support the multi-task approach of UniverSLU to increase the training data size.

5.4. Text to Speech (TTS)

	MCD \downarrow	F ₀ Corr \uparrow	SECS \uparrow	UTMOS \uparrow
USAT [63]	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.81
Baseline	11.54	0.1499	0.0677	3.13
FT	7.90	0.2744	0.5494	3.44

Table 4: Performance on VCTK test set. **Baseline** and **FT** represents the performance before and after full fine-tuning.

Task definition. The task aims to synthesize speech from text in the voice of the target speaker. Following [7], we evaluate performance using Mel Cepstral Distortion (MCD) [64], F₀ Pearson correlation coefficient (F₀ Corr), speaker embedding cosine similarity (SECS), and UTMOS [65]. For SECS, we use the speaker embeddings of ESPnet-SPK model [15] trained on VoxCeleb [66, 67].

Baselines. We use a VITS model pre-trained on LibriTTS [68] as our baseline and fully fine-tune on VCTK [69]. We compare our results with the state-of-the-art USAT model [63].

Fine-tuning details. For the task, we focus on fine-tuning the model, where a source TTS model is adapted to an unseen dataset containing unknown speakers. We use the same hyperparameters as pre-training, except for the AdamW optimizer with a learning rate

	Transcription (CER ↓)		Underlying (CER ↓)		Gloss (CER ↓)		Translation (chrF++ ↑)	
	Seen	Unseen	Seen	Unseen	Seen	Unseen	Seen	Unseen
v3.1-ebf-base [25,35]	48.2	67.7	54.8	80.0	75.0	102.9	13.7	11.6
v3.1-small [25]	48.2	67.3	47.8	75.0	76.4	113.1	13.6	10.4
v3.2-small [26]	43.1	67.1	48.5	76.4	83.0	121.7	13.1	10.1

Table 5: Performance on four subtasks within the Fieldwork corpus. OWSM variants are fine-tuned for each of the subtasks. We import the results from [35] for the v3.1-ebf-base model. Metrics are averaged per language. Unseen indicates languages unseen during training.

of 2e-4 and the batch size of 1 due to GPU memory constraints. Following the existing ESPnet-TTS recipe [7], we use 540 samples of VCTK for dev set, 540 samples for test set, and the rest for training.

Results. Table 4 demonstrates improved audio quality across all metrics after adaptation via fine-tuning. While the fine-tuned model does not achieve state-of-the-art performance, the results remain promising particularly given the constrained conditions, i.e., with a vanilla VITS architecture and limited data sources.

5.5. Low-resource Languages

Task definition. The Fieldwork corpus [35] provides linguistically rich annotations of 37 endangered languages. It contains four subtasks: transcription, underlying, gloss, and translation. Underlying and gloss can be understood as an intermediate task between transcription and translation. For the transcription task (ASR), the model has to use the orthography of each language. The underlying task is similar to the transcription task, where the model has to additionally segment by morpheme with the underlying representation before applying the phonological rules. The interlinear gloss task has the same segment as the underlying task, where the gloss additionally requires brief explanations for each morpheme. Target language of the translation task (ST) is English, which is evaluated by the modified character-level F-score (chrF++) [70]. All other tasks are evaluated by the character error rate (CER).

Fine-tuning details. [35] provides baselines using the OWSM v3.1-ebf-base model, fine-tuning the model on each of the tasks.⁶ For our experiments, we test bigger variants of OWSM, namely, v3.1-small [25] and v3.2-small [26]. v3.2-small differs with v3.1-small by the training data preprocessing strategy. For both v3.1-small and v3.2-small with larger parameter size (367M), we use a smaller learning rate of 1e-4 and batch size of 8 to meet the GPU constraints and stabilize the training. To make the number of iterations the same, we use 5 epochs.

Results. In Table 5, v3.2-small shows great performance in transcription, likely due to careful curation of the training data. However, the smallest v3.1-ebf-base performs best in both gloss and translation, arguably a more challenging task than transcription. One possible explanation is the limited number of epochs, where bigger models potentially require more iterations to train.

6. EASY INTEGRATION OF ESPNET-EZ

In this section, we go over various examples where ESPnet-EZ integrated with existing deep learning and dataset frameworks.

6.1. End-to-end Training with Multiple Models

One of the advantages of a Python-only codebase is that it allows to easy integration of pre-trained models from different frameworks.

⁶https://github.com/juice500ml/finetune_owsm

In Section 5.2, we demonstrate the case where the cascaded models’ components are from two different frameworks: ESPnet and transformers. As both models are PyTorch-based, we can train both with the ESPnet-EZ Trainer. This demonstrates the flexibility of ESPnet-EZ Python-only codebase.

6.2. Applying Audio Augmentations

As ESPnet-EZ’s dataset is a shallow wrapper for PyTorch’s vanilla datasets, one can easily apply various techniques during training. The user can choose either the dataset or the data loader (which includes batching techniques) to be inputted in the ESPnet-EZ trainer. For example, we demonstrate on-the-fly speech augmentation in Section 5.1. We apply various augmentation techniques from Lhotse while using the ESPnet-EZ trainer.

6.3. Integration with External Frameworks

In Figure 3, we observe that we can also skip the ESPnet-EZ Trainer when training the model. It is demonstrated in Section 5.5 where we swap ESPnet-EZ Trainer with the trainer from PyTorch-Lightning.

6.4. Online Fine-tuning Demo

We implemented a fine-tuning demonstration on Huggingface Spaces.⁷ Fine-tuning can be performed simply by uploading training data in a ZIP archive. The demo showcases the great integration ability of ESPnet-EZ, allowing users to evaluate the performance of the fine-tuned OWSM on a custom dataset within a few minutes.

7. CONCLUSION

In this work, we introduce ESPnet-EZ, an extension of the open-source speech processing toolkit ESPnet. ESPnet-EZ focuses on easier fine-tuning, inference, and integration with other deep learning frameworks. By removing the Kaldi-style dependencies, ESPnet-EZ provides a Python-only ESPnet interface, simplifying the process of implementation while maintaining all ESPnet task coverage. We provide various comparative analyses, demos, and experiments to corroborate the advantages above.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work used the Bridges2 system at PSC and Delta system at NCSA through allocation CIS210014 from the Advanced Cyberinfrastructure Coordination Ecosystem: Services & Support (ACCESS) program, which is supported by National Science Foundation grants #2138259, #2138286, #2138307, #2137603, and #2138296.

⁷https://huggingface.co/spaces/ms180/owsm_finetune

9. REFERENCES

- [1] Daniel Povey, Arnab Ghoshal, Gilles Boulianne, et al., “The Kaldi Speech Recognition Toolkit,” in *Proc. ASRU*, 2011.
- [2] Chris Bagwell et al., *sox(1) Linux User’s Manual*, Free Software Foundation, 2008.
- [3] Alfred Aho, Peter Weinberger, Brian Kernighan, et al., *awk(1) Linux User’s Manual*, Free Software Foundation, 2009.
- [4] Dennis Morse, Roland McGrath, and Mike Frysinger, *make(1) Linux User’s Manual*, Free Software Foundation, 1999.
- [5] Jonathan Fiscus et al., *SCTK, the NIST Scoring Toolkit (v2.4.12)*, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2021.
- [6] Shinji Watanabe, Takaaki Hori, Shigeki Karita, et al., “ESPnet: End-to-end speech processing toolkit,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2018.
- [7] Tomoki Hayashi, Ryuichi Yamamoto, Katsuki Inoue, et al., “ESPnet-TTS: Unified, reproducible, and integratable open source end-to-end text-to-speech toolkit,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2020.
- [8] Tomoki Hayashi, Ryuichi Yamamoto, Takenori Yoshimura, et al., “ESPnet2-TTS: Extending the edge of tts research,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07840*, 2021.
- [9] Hirofumi Inaguma, Shun Kiyono, Kevin Duh, et al., “ESPnet-ST: All-in-one speech translation toolkit,” in *Proc. ACL*, 2020.
- [10] Chenda Li, Jing Shi, Wangyou Zhang, et al., “ESPnet-SE: End-to-end speech enhancement and separation toolkit designed for ASR integration,” in *Proc. SLT*, 2021.
- [11] Siddhant Arora, Siddharth Dalmia, Pavel Denisov, et al., “ESPnet-SLU: Advancing spoken language understanding through espnet,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022.
- [12] Jiatong Shi, Shuai Guo, Tao Qian, et al., “Muskits: an end-to-end music processing toolkit for singing voice synthesis,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2022.
- [13] Yen-Ju Lu, Xuankai Chang, Chenda Li, et al., “ESPnet-SE++: Speech Enhancement for Robust Speech Recognition, Translation, and Understanding,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2022.
- [14] Dongji Gao, Jiatong Shi, Shun-Po Chuang, et al., “EURO: ESPnet Unsupervised ASR Open-source Toolkit,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2023.
- [15] Jee-weon Jung, Wangyou Zhang, Jiatong Shi, et al., “ESPnet-SPK: full pipeline speaker embedding toolkit with reproducible recipes, self-supervised front-ends, and off-the-shelf models,” *Proc. Interspeech*, 2024.
- [16] Brian Yan, Jiatong Shi, Yun Tang, et al., “ESPnet-ST-v2: Multipurpose spoken language translation toolkit,” in *Proc. ACL*, 2023.
- [17] Jiatong Shi, William Chen, Dan Berrebbi, et al., “Findings of the 2023 ML-SUPERB challenge: Pre-training and evaluation over more languages and beyond,” in *Proc. ASRU*, 2023.
- [18] Samuele Cornell, Matthew Wiesner, Shinji Watanabe, et al., “The CHiME-7 DASR Challenge: Distant Meeting Transcription with Multiple Devices in Diverse Scenarios,” in *7th International Workshop on Speech Processing in Everyday Environments (CHiME 2023)*, 2023.
- [19] Yi Zhao, Wen-Chin Huang, Xiaohai Tian, et al., “Voice Conversion Challenge 2020: Intra-lingual semi-parallel and cross-lingual voice conversion,” *Joint Workshop for the Blizzard Challenge and Voice Conversion Challenge*, 2020.
- [20] Wei-Ning Hsu, Benjamin Bolte, Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, et al., “HuBERT: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. Audio, Speech, Lang. Process.*, 2021.
- [21] William Chen, Xuankai Chang, Yifan Peng, et al., “Reducing Barriers to Self-Supervised Learning: HuBERT Pre-training with Academic Compute,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2023.
- [22] Alexei Baevski, Wei-Ning Hsu, Alexis Conneau, and Michael Auli, “Unsupervised speech recognition,” in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [23] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Tao Xu, et al., “Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2023.
- [24] Yifan Peng, Jinchuan Tian, Brian Yan, et al., “Reproducing whisper-style training using an open-source toolkit and publicly available data,” in *Proc. ASRU*, 2023.
- [25] Yifan Peng, Jinchuan Tian, William Chen, et al., “OWSM v3.1: Better and faster open whisper-style speech models based on e-branchformer,” *Proc. Interspeech*, 2024.
- [26] Jinchuan Tian, Yifan Peng, William Chen, et al., “On the Effects of Heterogeneous Data Sources on Speech-to-Text Foundation Models,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2024.
- [27] Yifan Peng, Yui Sudo, Muhammad Shakeel, and Shinji Watanabe, “OWSM-CTC: An open encoder-only speech foundation model for speech recognition, translation, and language identification,” *Proc. ACL*, 2024.
- [28] Siddhant Arora, Hayato Futami, Jee-weon Jung, et al., “UniverSLU: Universal spoken language understanding for diverse classification and sequence generation tasks with a single network,” in *Proc. ACL*, 2024.
- [29] Soumi Maiti, Yifan Peng, Shukjae Choi, et al., “VoxLM: Unified decoder-only models for consolidating speech recognition, synthesis and speech, text continuation tasks,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2024.
- [30] Shu-wen Yang, Po-Han Chi, Yung-Sung Chuang, et al., “SUPERB: Speech processing Universal PERFORMANCE benchmark,” *Proc. Interspeech*, 2021.
- [31] Jiatong Shi, Dan Berrebbi, William Chen, et al., “ML-SUPERB: Multilingual speech universal performance benchmark,” *Proc. Interspeech*, 2023.
- [32] Jiatong Shi, Shih-Heng Wang, William Chen, et al., “ML-SUPERB 2.0: Benchmarking multilingual speech models across modeling constraints, languages, and datasets,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2024.
- [33] Suwon Shon, Ankita Pasad, Felix Wu, et al., “Slue: New benchmark tasks for spoken language understanding evaluation on natural speech,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022.
- [34] Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, et al., “Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2021.
- [35] Taiqi He, Kwanghee Choi, Lindia Tjuatja, et al., “Wav2Gloss: Generating interlinear glossed text from speech,” in *Proc. ACL*, 2024.

- [36] Kwanghee Choi, Martin Kersner, Jacob Morton, and Buru Chang, “Temporal knowledge distillation for on-device audio classification,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022.
- [37] Puyuan Peng, Brian Yan, Shinji Watanabe, and David Harwath, “Prompting the hidden talent of web-scale speech models for zero-shot task generalization,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2023.
- [38] Brian McFee, Colin Raffel, Dawen Liang, et al., “librosa: Audio and music signal analysis in python.,” in *Proc. Python in Science Conferences*, 2015.
- [39] Yao-Yuan Yang, Moto Hira, Zhaoheng Ni, et al., “Torchaudio: Building blocks for audio and speech processing,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022.
- [40] Python Software Foundation, *Python Package Index (PyPI)*, 2024.
- [41] Anaconda, Inc., *Anaconda Software Distribution (v2-2.4.0)*, 2016.
- [42] Nicki Skaftø Detlefsen, Jiri Borovec, Justus Schock, et al., “TorchMetrics - Measuring Reproducibility in PyTorch,” *Journal of Open Source Software*, vol. 7, no. 70, pp. 4101, 2022.
- [43] Leandro Von Werra, Lewis Tunstall, Abhishek Thakur, et al., “Evaluate & Evaluation on the Hub: Better Best Practices for Data and Model Measurements,” in *Proc. EMNLP*, 2022.
- [44] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, et al., “Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*, 2019.
- [45] Manuel Pariente, Samuele Cornell, Joris Cosentino, et al., “Asteroid: the PyTorch-based audio source separation toolkit for researchers,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2020.
- [46] Oleksii Kuchaiev, Jason Li, Huyen Nguyen, et al., “NeMo: a toolkit for building AI applications using Neural Modules,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09577*, 2019.
- [47] Mirco Ravanelli, Titouan Parcollet, Peter Plantinga, et al., “SpeechBrain: A General-Purpose Speech Toolkit,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04624*, 2021.
- [48] Zhuoyuan Yao, Di Wu, Xiong Wang, et al., “WeNet: Production oriented Streaming and Non-streaming End-to-End Speech Recognition Toolkit,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2021.
- [49] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, et al., “PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library,” *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [50] Quentin Lhoest, Albert Villanova del Moral, Yacine Jernite, et al., “Datasets: A Community Library for Natural Language Processing,” in *Proc. EMNLP*, 2021.
- [51] Piotr Żelasko, Daniel Povey, Jan Trmal, et al., “Lhotse: a speech data representation library for the modern deep learning ecosystem,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.12561*, 2021.
- [52] Vassil Panayotov, Guoguo Chen, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev Khudanpur, “Librispeech: An asr corpus based on public domain audio books,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2015.
- [53] Sanyuan Chen, Chengyi Wang, Zhengyang Chen, et al., “Wavlm: Large-scale self-supervised pre-training for full stack speech processing,” *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, 2022.
- [54] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter, “Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2019.
- [55] Brian Yan, Siddharth Dalmia, Yosuke Higuchi, et al., “CTC alignments improve autoregressive translation,” in *Proc. EACL*, 2023.
- [56] Roldano Cattoni, Mattia Antonino Di Gangi, Luisa Bentivogli, et al., “MuST-C: A multilingual corpus for end-to-end speech translation,” *Computer Speech & Language*, 2021.
- [57] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu, “Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation,” in *Proc. ACL*, 2002.
- [58] Maja Popović, “chrF: character n-gram F-score for automatic MT evaluation,” in *Proceedings of the Tenth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, 2015.
- [59] Matthew Snover, Bonnie Dorr, Rich Schwartz, et al., “A study of translation edit rate with targeted human annotation,” in *Proc. AMTA*, 2006.
- [60] Matt Post, “A call for clarity in reporting BLEU scores,” in *Proc. WMT*, 2018.
- [61] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, et al., “Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer,” *JMLR*, 2020.
- [62] Emanuele Bastianelli, Andrea Vanzo, Pawel Swietojanski, and Verena Rieser, “SLURP: A Spoken Language Understanding Resource Package,” in *Proc. EMNLP*, 2020.
- [63] Wenbin Wang, Yang Song, and Sanjay Jha, “USAT: A Universal Speaker-Adaptive Text-to-Speech Approach,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. Audio, Speech, Lang. Process.*, 2024.
- [64] Robert F. Kubichek, “Mel-cepstral distance measure for objective speech quality assessment,” in *Proc. IEEE PACRIM*, 1993.
- [65] Takaaki Saeki, Detai Xin, Wataru Nakata, et al., “UTokyo-SaruLab System for VoiceMOS Challenge 2022,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2022.
- [66] Arsha Nagrani, Joon Son Chung, and Andrew Senior, “VoxCeleb: A Large-Scale Speaker Identification Dataset,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2017.
- [67] Joon Son Chung, Arsha Nagrani, and Andrew Senior, “VoxCeleb2: Deep Speaker Recognition,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2018.
- [68] Heiga Zen, Viet Dang, Rob Clark, et al., “LibriTTS: A Corpus Derived from LibriSpeech for Text-to-Speech,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2019.
- [69] Junichi Yamagishi, Christophe Veaux, Kirsten MacDonald, et al., “CSTR VCTK Corpus: English multi-speaker corpus for CSTR voice cloning toolkit (version 0.92),” *Univ. of Edinburgh. Centre for Speech Technology Research*, 2019.
- [70] Maja Popović, “chrF++: words helping character n-grams,” in *Proc. WMT*, 2017.

10. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

10.1. User feedbacks

10.1.1. Pros

- It was much easier to write, understand and update pythonic code according to my requirements instead of bash scripts
- The compatibility with Hugging Face made it far less intimidating, as I could transfer my knowledge of the Hugging Face datasets library and trainer () API to ESPnet. I imagine this would make it a much easier entry point for beginners as well.
- It is user friendly because everything can be done with Python. Unlike previous demos where we had to edit bash files, we were able to easily change the parameters and fine-tune the model with python scripts
- ESPnet EZ is quite easy to use, without the need to actually touch the low-level details of ESPnet.
- Espnet EZ is a more straightforward tool to work with.
- Staying within the python to make config changes makes it very simple to implement configuration changes.
- My experience with ESPnet EZ is very good
- ESPnet EZ provides a more convenient way to use ESPnet. It is a bit similar to Hugging Face abstractions
- ESPnet EZ is easier to use and has less complexity. It has a simpler configuration and easier setup, making it more accessible to beginners or those interested in fast implementation
- ESPnet-EZ comes with predefined pipelines and pretrain model loading, making it easier to perform common speech processing tasks without needing to train models from scratch
- I love it. It is much more similar to other tools I have used before. I instantly recognize the Trainer class as similar to the class of the same name from the transformers library for text.
- I think it is easier for implementing
- Espnet EZ significantly lowers the entry barrier for users, especially those familiar with python and huggingface frameworks as it is less script heavy
- It has more intuitive usage of popular frameworks, making it easier for newcomers to grasp and utilize
- The codebase of ESPnet EZ is more readable and interpretable compared to the traditional ESPnet toolkit
- Its alignment with mainstream deep learning practices, where users can easily understand the structure and flow of the code, facilitating easier customization and troubleshooting
- Since everything was python based it made it much easier to use.
- It helps a lot on understanding how to use ESPnet
- It allows user to implement speech processing capabilities quickly and with minimal setup
- Has a more user-friendly interface, simplified workflow for common tasks
- Convenient toolkit for applying some finetuning techniques like LORA

- ESPnet EZ is really user friendly
- Dataset format conversion is straightforward
- Training configuration is readable
- It feels more intuitive because it is python based
- EZ simplifies ASR tasks with user-friendly iteraces and pre-trained models

10.1.2. Cons

- Lack of evaluation framework is the most apparent issue. Having to rely on accuracy plots each time you change hyperparameters is cumbersome
- Additionally, there is no support for hyperparameter optimization, which can be really useful for ablation studies for research projects
- Advanced users who require more control over various parameters and models may find it limited in terms of customization. Due to its simplification, it may not support all the advanced features and functionalities
- It lacks fine-grained control of the entire training procedure. When we want to add a new pipeline that is not in ESPnet, we still need to go back to the original ESPnet.
- Using the bash scripts might have the advantage of providing more control over how the different files are run
- It may limit the flexibility and customizability available to users. For some detailed and complex settings, I would choose ESPnet
- ESPnet EZ might not keep up with the latest updates as quickly as the main ESPnet toolkit
- It might be harder to debug if any unsuspected things happen.
- I would imagine ESPnet is more robust and potentially slightly faster to compensate for its difficulty
- It comes at the cost of the depth of customization and the range of features
- Less flexibility for advanced users and possibly limited options for customizations
- Not sure if EZ supports building a new module based on an existing model with some small changes (such as adding a linear layer at the end)
- Same as python versus shell
- May offer limited customization and control compared to full ESPnet