

MGIC INVESTMENT CORP

Form 424B5

April 23, 2010

Table of Contents

**Filed pursuant to Rule 424(b)(5)
Registration Statement No. 333-166175**

CALCULATION OF REGISTRATION FEE

Title of Each Class of Securities to Be Registered	Maximum Aggregate Offering Price(1)	Amount of Registration Fee(2)(3)
Common Stock, \$1.00 par value		
Common Stock Purchase Rights(4)	\$804,999,990	\$57,396

- (1) Includes 9,767,441 shares of common stock to be sold upon exercise of the underwriters' over-allotment option.
- (2) Calculated in accordance with Rule 457(r) under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended.
- (3) Pursuant to Rule 457(p), the \$57,396.50 filing fee is offset by \$33,405.00 of the registration fee that was paid on March 4, 2009 pursuant to Rule 456(b), but unused, in connection with MGIC Investment Corporation's Registration Statement on Form S-3 (Reg. No. 333-157691).
- (4) The common share purchase rights are attached to and traded with the shares of common stock being registered. The value attributable to the common share purchase rights, if any, is reflected in the value attributable to the common stock.

Prospectus Supplement to Prospectus dated April 20, 2010

65,116,279 Shares

MGIC INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Common Stock

We are offering 65,116,279 shares of our common stock.

Our common stock is traded on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol **MTG**. On April 20, 2010, the last sale price of our common stock as reported on the New York Stock Exchange was \$11.06 per share.

Before making any investment in the common stock, you should carefully consider the risks that are described in the Risk Factors section beginning on page S-9 of this prospectus supplement.

Neither the Securities and Exchange Commission nor any state securities commission has approved or disapproved of these securities or determined if this prospectus supplement or the accompanying prospectus is truthful or complete. Any representation to the contrary is a criminal offense.

	Per Share	Total
Initial price to public	\$ 10.75	\$ 699,999,999
Underwriting discount	\$ 0.43	\$ 28,000,000
Proceeds, before expenses, to us	\$ 10.32	\$ 671,999,999

To the extent that the underwriters sell more than 65,116,279 shares of common stock, the underwriters have the option to purchase up to an additional 9,767,441 shares from us at the initial price to public less the underwriting discount.

The underwriters expect to deliver the shares of our common stock to purchasers in book-entry form only, through The Depository Trust Company, on or about April 26, 2010 in New York, New York, against payment therefor in immediately available funds.

Sole Book-Running Manager

Goldman, Sachs & Co.

Barclays Capital

J.P. Morgan

Dowling & Partners Securities LLC

Keefe, Bruyette & Woods, Inc.

Northland Securities

Piper Jaffray

Prospectus Supplement dated April 21, 2010.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Prospectus Supplement	
<u>About This Prospectus Supplement</u>	S-ii
<u>Cautionary Statement About Forward-Looking Statements</u>	S-iii
<u>Summary</u>	S-1
<u>Risk Factors</u>	S-9
<u>Use of Proceeds</u>	S-27
<u>Capitalization</u>	S-28
<u>Price Range of Common Stock and Dividend Policy</u>	S-29
<u>Selected Consolidated Financial Information</u>	S-30
<u>Description of Capital Stock</u>	S-32
<u>Material U.S. Federal Tax Consequences for Non-U.S. Holders</u>	S-36
<u>Underwriting</u>	S-40
<u>Legal Matters</u>	S-44
<u>Experts</u>	S-44
Prospectus	
<u>Limitations on Ownership of our Voting Securities</u>	i
<u>About This Prospectus</u>	1
<u>The Company</u>	1
<u>Use of Proceeds</u>	1
<u>Ratio of Earnings to Fixed Charges</u>	2
<u>Description of Debt Securities</u>	2
<u>Description of Capital Stock</u>	10
<u>Description of Depositary Shares</u>	14
<u>Description of Warrants</u>	16
<u>Description of Stock Purchase Contracts and Stock Purchase Units</u>	17
<u>Legal Ownership and Book Entry Issuance</u>	18
<u>Plan of Distribution</u>	20
<u>Where You Can Find More Information</u>	22
<u>Legal Matters</u>	23
<u>Experts</u>	23

Table of Contents

ABOUT THIS PROSPECTUS SUPPLEMENT

This document is in two parts. The first part is this prospectus supplement, which describes the specific terms of this offering. The second part, the accompanying prospectus, gives more general information, some of which may not apply to this offering. Generally, when we refer only to the prospectus, we are referring to both parts combined.

If information in this prospectus supplement is inconsistent with the accompanying prospectus, you should rely on this prospectus supplement. This prospectus supplement, the accompanying prospectus, any other offering material and the documents incorporated into each by reference include important information about us, the shares of our common stock being offered and other information you should know before investing. You should read this prospectus supplement and the accompanying prospectus as well as additional information described under *Where You Can Find More Information* in the accompanying prospectus before investing in shares of our common stock.

You should rely only on the information contained or incorporated by reference in this prospectus supplement, the accompanying prospectus and any other offering material we or the underwriters provide. We have not, and the underwriters have not, authorized any other person to provide you with different information. If anyone provides you with different or inconsistent information, you should not rely on it. You should assume that the information contained or incorporated by reference in this prospectus supplement and the accompanying prospectus is accurate only as of the date of this prospectus supplement or the accompanying prospectus, as the case maybe, or in the case of the documents incorporated by reference, the date of such documents, regardless of the time of delivery of this prospectus supplement and the accompanying prospectus or any sales of our common stock. Our business, financial condition, results of operations and prospects may have changed since those dates.

Unless the context otherwise requires, the terms *Company*, *we*, *our* and *us* and other similar terms mean MGIC Investment Corporation and its consolidated subsidiaries, and references to *MGIC* and to *Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corporation* mean our primary insurance subsidiary, Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corporation. *Credit-Based Asset Servicing and Securitization LLC (C-BASS)* and our other less than majority-owned joint ventures are not consolidated with us for financial reporting purposes, are not our subsidiaries and are not included in the terms *we*, *our* and *us* and other similar terms. The description of our business in this prospectus generally does not apply to our international operations which began in 2007, were conducted only in Australia (we are not currently writing any new insurance in Australia), and are immaterial.

Table of Contents

CAUTIONARY STATEMENT ABOUT FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

This prospectus supplement, the accompanying prospectus and any other offering material, and the documents incorporated by reference in this prospectus supplement, the accompanying prospectus and any other offering material, contain statements that we believe to be forward-looking statements within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. All statements other than historical facts, including, without limitation, statements regarding our future financial position, business strategy, projected revenues, claims, earnings, costs, debt and equity levels, and plans and objectives of management for future operations, are forward-looking statements. When used in this prospectus supplement, the accompanying prospectus, any other offering material and the documents incorporated by reference, words such as we expect , intend , plan , estimate , anticipate , believe or the negative thereof or variations thereon or similar terminology are generally intended to identify forward-looking statements. Such forward-looking statements are subject to risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from those expressed in, or implied by, such statements. Some, but not all, of the risks and uncertainties include the factors described under Risk Factors .

We urge you to consider these factors before investing in our common stock. The forward-looking statements included in this prospectus supplement, the accompanying prospectus and any other offering material, or in the documents incorporated by reference into this prospectus supplement, the accompanying prospectus and any other offering material, are made only as of the date of the prospectus supplement, the accompanying prospectus, any other offering material or the incorporated document, and we undertake no obligation to publicly update these statements to reflect subsequent events or circumstances.

S-iii

Table of Contents

SUMMARY

The information below is only a summary of more detailed information included elsewhere in, or incorporated by reference in, this prospectus supplement and the accompanying prospectus. This summary may not contain all the information that is important to you or that you should consider before making a decision to invest in our common stock. For a more complete understanding of us and this offering, please read this entire prospectus supplement and the accompanying prospectus, especially the risks of investing in our common stock discussed under "Risk Factors", as well as the information incorporated by reference in this prospectus supplement and the accompanying prospectus, carefully.

MGIC Investment Corporation

We are a holding company and through wholly owned subsidiaries we are the leading provider of private mortgage insurance in the United States. In 2009, our net premiums written exceeded \$1.2 billion and our new insurance written was \$19.9 billion. As of December 31, 2009, our insurance in force was \$212.2 billion and our risk in force was \$54.3 billion. As of December 31, 2009, our principal subsidiary, MGIC, was licensed in all 50 states of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and Guam. Through December 31, 2009, MGIC wrote all of our new insurance throughout the United States. However, in 2010 we expect our subsidiary, MGIC Indemnity Corporation, or MIC, to begin writing new insurance in jurisdictions where MGIC does not meet minimum capital requirements and does not obtain a waiver of those requirements. For more information about MIC and our plans to utilize it to continue writing new insurance throughout the United States, see "Risk Factors - Risks Related to Our Business - Even though our plan to write new insurance in MIC has received approval from the Office of the Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin (OCI) and the GSEs, because MGIC is not expected to meet statutory risk-to-capital requirements to write new business in various states, we cannot guarantee that the implementation of our plan will allow us to continue to write new insurance on an uninterrupted basis." In addition to mortgage insurance on first liens, we, through our subsidiaries, provide lenders with various underwriting and other services and products related to home mortgage lending.

Overview of the Private Mortgage Insurance Industry

The private mortgage insurance industry was established in 1957 by MGIC to provide a private market alternative to federal government insurance programs. Private mortgage insurance covers losses from homeowner defaults on residential first mortgage loans, reducing and, in some instances, eliminating the loss to the insured institution if the homeowner defaults. Private mortgage insurance plays an important role in the housing finance system by expanding home ownership opportunities through helping people purchase homes with less than 20% down payments, especially first time homebuyers. In this prospectus supplement, we refer to loans with less than 20% down payments as "low down payment mortgages or loans." During 2008 and 2009, approximately \$193 billion and \$82 billion, respectively, of mortgages were insured by private mortgage insurance companies.

Private mortgage insurance facilitates the sale of low down payment mortgages in the secondary mortgage market to the Federal National Mortgage Association, commonly known as Fannie Mae, and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, commonly known as Freddie Mac. In this prospectus supplement, we refer to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac collectively as the "GSEs." The GSEs purchase residential mortgages from mortgage lenders and investors as part of their governmental mandate to provide liquidity in the secondary mortgage market and we believe that the GSEs purchased over 50% of the mortgages underlying our flow new insurance written during the last five years. As a result, the private mortgage insurance industry in the U.S. is defined in part by the requirements and practices of the GSEs. These requirements and practices, as well as those of the federal regulators that oversee the GSEs and lenders,

impact the operating results and financial performance of companies in the mortgage insurance industry. See Risk Factors Risks Related to

S-1

Table of Contents

Our Business Changes in the business practices of the GSEs, federal legislation that changes their charters or a restructuring of the GSEs could reduce our revenues or increase our losses . Private mortgage insurance also reduces the regulatory capital that depository institutions are required to hold against low down payment mortgages that they hold as assets.

The U.S. single-family residential mortgage market has historically experienced long-term growth, including an increase in mortgage debt outstanding every year between 1985, when MGIC began operations, and 2007. The rate of growth in U.S. residential mortgage debt was particularly strong from 2001 through 2006. In 2007, this growth rate began slowing and, since 2007, U.S. residential mortgage debt has decreased. During the last several years of this period of increased growth and continuing through 2007, the mortgage lending industry increasingly made home loans at higher loan-to-value ratios, to individuals with higher risk credit profiles and based on less documentation and verification of information regarding the borrower. Beginning in 2007, job creation slowed and the housing markets began slowing in certain areas, with declines in certain other areas. In 2008 and 2009, payroll employment in the U.S. decreased substantially and substantially all areas experienced home price declines. Together, these conditions resulted in significant adverse developments for us and our industry. After earning an average of approximately \$580 million annually from 2004 through 2006 and earning \$169 million in the first half of 2007, we had net losses of \$1.670 billion for full year 2007, \$525.4 million for 2008 and \$1.322 billion for 2009. Beginning in 2008 and 2009, the insurer financial strength rating of MGIC was downgraded a number of times by all three rating agencies. See

Risk Factors Risks Related to Our Business MGIC may not continue to meet the GSEs mortgage insurer eligibility requirements .

Beginning in late 2007, we implemented a series of changes to our underwriting guidelines that are designed to improve the credit risk profile of our new insurance written. The changes primarily affect borrowers who have multiple risk factors such as a high loan-to-value ratio, a lower FICO score and limited documentation or are financing a home in a market we categorize as higher risk and include the creation of two tiers of restricted markets . Our underwriting criteria for restricted markets do not allow insurance to be written on certain loans that could be insured if the property were located in an unrestricted market. Beginning in September 2009, we removed several markets from our restricted markets list and moved several other markets from our Tier Two restricted market list (for which our underwriting guidelines are most limiting) to our Tier One restricted market list. In addition, we have made other changes that have relaxed our underwriting guidelines and expect to continue to make changes in appropriate circumstances that will do so in the future.

Due to the changing environment, including that described above, at this time we are facing two particularly significant challenges:

Whether we will have access to sufficient capital to continue to write new business beyond 2011. For additional information about this challenge, see **Risk Factors** Risks Related to Our Business Even though our plan to write new insurance in MIC has received approval from the Office of the Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin (OCI) and the GSEs, because MGIC is not expected to meet statutory risk-to-capital requirements to write new business in various states, we cannot guarantee that the implementation of our plan will allow us to continue to write new insurance on an uninterrupted basis .

Whether private mortgage insurance will remain a significant credit enhancement alternative for low down payment single family mortgages. For additional information about this challenge, see **Risk Factors** Risks Related to Our Business Changes in the business practices of the GSEs, federal legislation that changes their charters or a restructuring of the GSEs could reduce our revenues or increase our losses .

Table of Contents**Principal Mortgage Insurance Products**

In general, there are two principal types of private mortgage insurance: primary and pool. We are currently not issuing new commitments for pool insurance and expect that the volume of any future pool business will be insignificant to us.

Primary Insurance. Primary insurance provides mortgage default protection on individual loans and covers unpaid loan principal, delinquent interest and certain expenses associated with the default and subsequent foreclosure (collectively, the claim amount). In addition to the loan principal, the claim amount is affected by the mortgage note rate and the time necessary to complete the foreclosure process, which can be lengthened due to foreclosure moratoriums. The insurer generally pays the coverage percentage of the claim amount specified in the primary policy, but has the option to pay 100% of the claim amount and acquire title to the property. Primary insurance is generally written on first mortgage loans secured by owner occupied single-family homes, which are one-to-four family homes and condominiums. Primary insurance is also written on first liens secured by non-owner occupied single-family homes, which are referred to in the home mortgage lending industry as investor loans, and on vacation or second homes. Primary coverage can be used on any type of residential mortgage loan instrument approved by the mortgage insurer.

Primary insurance may be written on a flow basis, in which loans are insured in individual, loan-by-loan transactions, or may be written on a bulk basis, in which each loan in a portfolio of loans is individually insured in a single, bulk transaction. New insurance written on a flow basis was \$19.9 billion in 2009 compared to \$46.6 billion in 2008 and \$69.0 billion in 2007. No new insurance written for bulk transactions was written in 2009, compared to \$1.6 billion for 2008 and \$7.8 billion in 2007. In the fourth quarter of 2007, we decided to stop writing the portion of our bulk business that insures mortgage loans included in home equity (or private label) securitizations, which are the terms the market uses to refer to securitizations sponsored by firms besides the GSEs or the Government National Mortgage Association, commonly known as Ginnie Mae, such as Wall Street investment banks. We refer to portfolios of loans we insured through the bulk channel that we knew would serve as collateral in a home equity securitization as Wall Street bulk transactions. While we will continue to insure loans on a bulk basis when we believe that the loans will be sold to a GSE or retained by the lender, we expect the volume of any future business written through the bulk channel will be insignificant to us.

The following table shows, on a direct basis, primary insurance in force (the unpaid principal balance of insured loans as reflected in our records) and primary risk in force (the coverage percentage applied to the unpaid principal balance) for insurance that has been written by MGIC as of the dates indicated:

	2009	2008	December 31, 2007 (In millions)	2006	2005
Direct Primary Insurance In Force	\$ 212,182	\$ 226,995	\$ 211,745	\$ 176,531	\$ 170,029
Direct Primary Risk In Force	\$ 54,343	\$ 58,981	\$ 55,794	\$ 47,079	\$ 44,860

Pool Insurance. Pool insurance is generally used as an additional credit enhancement for certain secondary market mortgage transactions. Pool insurance generally covers the loss on a defaulted mortgage loan which exceeds the claim payment under the primary coverage, if primary insurance is required on that mortgage loan, as well as the total loss on a defaulted mortgage loan which did not require primary insurance. Pool insurance usually has a stated aggregate

loss limit and may also have a deductible under which no losses are paid by the insurer until losses exceed the deductible.

We are currently not issuing new commitments for pool insurance and expect that the volume of any future pool business will be insignificant to us. New pool risk written was \$4 million in 2009, \$145 million in 2008 and \$211 million in 2007. New pool risk written during 2007 was primarily

S-3

Table of Contents

comprised of risk associated with loans delivered to the GSEs (agency pool insurance), loans insured through private label securitizations, loans delivered to the Federal Home Loan Banks under their mortgage purchase programs and loans made under state housing finance programs. New pool risk written during 2008 was primarily comprised of risk associated with agency pool insurance and loans made under state housing finance programs. Direct pool risk in force at December 31, 2009 was \$1.7 billion compared to \$1.9 billion and \$2.8 billion at December 31, 2008 and 2007, respectively. The risk amounts referred to above represent pools of loans with contractual aggregate loss limits and in some cases those without these limits. For pools of loans without these limits, risk is estimated based on the amount that would credit enhance these loans to a AA level based on a rating agency model. Under this model, at December 31, 2009, 2008 and 2007 for \$2.0 billion, \$2.5 billion and \$4.1 billion, respectively, of risk without these limits, risk in force is calculated at \$190 million, \$150 million and \$475 million, respectively. One of our pool insurance insureds is computing the aggregate loss limit under a pool insurance policy at a higher level than we are computing this limit. See Summary Consolidated Financial Information Footnote (1) for more information.

Recent Developments First Quarter 2010 Financial Information

The following contains certain financial and operating information for us as of and for the three months ended March 31, 2010 and 2009:

	Three Months Ended March 31,	
	2010	2009
	(dollar amounts in millions)	
Revenues:		
Net insurance written (millions)	\$ 1,796	\$ 6,400
Net premiums written	256	348
Total revenues	371	435
Incurred losses	455	758
Net loss	(150)	(185)
Net paid losses	519	356
Investments (including cash and cash equivalents)	8,288	8,638
Operating ratios (insurance operations):		
Loss ratio	167%	213%
Expense ratio	18.4	14.7
Risk to capital ratio MGIC	20.2	14.2
Primary notice inventory	241,244	195,718

New insurance written for the 2010 quarter totaled \$1.8 billion with market share approximating 20% through February (March share data is not yet available). The lower volumes were driven by the continued high share of the Federal Housing Administration, a loss of business from a major lender as a result of our rescission practices, and a lower overall origination market.

For the 2010 quarter, total revenues were \$371 million, below the \$435 million reported in the first quarter of 2009. Net premiums written of \$256 million were below the \$348 million reported in the same period last year. The decreases were principally due to the increase in estimate for premium refunds on expected future rescissions and premium refunds on rescissions in the current period as well as a decrease in the average insurance in force.

Losses incurred were \$455 million versus \$758 million a year ago with loss reserves now totaling \$6.6 billion. The decrease in losses incurred was primarily attributable to a decrease of 9,196 delinquent loans in the 2010 quarter. This was the first decline in the delinquent inventory since the first quarter of 2007. It is too early, however, to predict whether the inventory will decline in subsequent quarters. Net paid claims in the quarter were \$519 million versus \$356 million in the first quarter of 2009. The average primary paid claim was \$53,070 down from \$53,585 in the first quarter of 2009.

S-4

Table of Contents

Investments (including cash and cash equivalents) declined reflecting our negative cash flow and the resulting need to liquidate investments to pay claims, circumstances which are expected to continue.

Concurrent Convertible Senior Note Offering

Concurrently with this offering of common stock, we are publicly offering \$300,000,000 in aggregate principal amount of convertible notes (or \$345,000,000 in aggregate principal amount if the underwriters exercise their over-allotment option in full).

The convertible notes will bear interest at a rate of 5% per year. The convertible notes will mature on May 1, 2017. The convertible notes will be convertible at the option of the holder at any time until the close of business on the second scheduled trading day immediately preceding the maturity date. The conversion rate will initially be 74.4186 shares of common stock per \$1,000 principal amount of notes (equivalent to a conversion price of approximately \$13.44 per share of common stock), subject to adjustment. Upon conversion, we will deliver a number of shares equal to the aggregate principal amount of the notes to be converted divided by \$1,000, multiplied by the then applicable conversion rate.

We estimate that the proceeds from the convertible notes offering will be approximately \$290.8 million (or \$334.5 million if the underwriters exercise their over-allotment option in full), after deducting the underwriting discount and offering expenses payable by us. We intend to use the net proceeds from this offering and the convertible notes offering to provide funds to repay at maturity or repurchase prior to maturity the \$78,409,000 outstanding principal amount of our 5.625% Senior Notes due 2011 and for our general corporate purposes, which may include improving liquidity by providing funds for debt service and increasing the capital of MGIC and other subsidiaries. See Use of Proceeds .

The convertible notes offering will be effected pursuant to a separate prospectus supplement. This prospectus supplement shall not be deemed an offer to sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy any of the convertible notes. There is no assurance that the convertible notes offering will be completed or, if completed, on what terms it may be completed. The convertible notes offering and this offering are not contingent upon each other.

Unless we specifically state otherwise, the information in this prospectus supplement assumes the completion of the convertible notes offering and that the underwriters for the convertible notes offering do not exercise their over-allotment option to purchase additional convertible notes and that the underwriters for this offering do not exercise their option to purchase additional shares of our common stock.

Risk Factors

Please read Risk Factors and the other information in this prospectus supplement and the accompanying prospectus for a discussion of factors you should carefully consider before deciding to invest in shares of our common stock.

Corporate Information

We are a Wisconsin corporation. Our principal office is located at MGIC Plaza, 250 East Kilbourn Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202 (telephone number (414) 347-6480).

Table of Contents**The Offering**

The summary below describes some of the terms of the offering. For a more complete description of our common stock, see Description of Capital Stock .

Issuer	MGIC Investment Corporation
Common stock offered	65,116,279 Shares
Over-allotment option	9,767,441 Shares
Shares outstanding after this offering (1)	190,677,975 Shares
Use of proceeds	We intend to use the net proceeds from this offering and the convertible notes offering to provide funds to repay at maturity or repurchase prior to maturity the \$78,409,000 outstanding principal amount of our 5.625% Senior Notes due 2011 and for our general corporate purposes, which may include improving liquidity by providing funds for debt service and increasing the capital of MGIC and other subsidiaries. The 5.625% senior notes mature on September 15, 2011.
New York Stock Exchange Symbol	MTG

- (1) The number of shares outstanding after this offering is based on 125,561,696 shares outstanding as of March 31, 2010. If the over-allotment option for this transaction is exercised in full, we will issue and sell an additional 9,767,441 shares of our common stock. The number of shares outstanding does not give effect to the conversion option of our outstanding 9% convertible junior subordinated debentures due 2063 or the convertible notes being offered in the concurrent convertible offering.

Table of Contents**Summary Consolidated Financial Information**

The following financial information as of and for each of the years in the three-year period ended December 31, 2009 is derived from our audited consolidated financial statements and related notes incorporated by reference herein. You should read the financial information presented below in conjunction with our consolidated financial statements and accompanying notes as well as the management's discussion and analysis of results of operations and financial condition, all of which are incorporated by reference into this prospectus. See "Where You Can Find More Information" in the accompanying prospectus.

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2009	2008	2007
Summary of Operations (in thousands, except per share information)			
Revenues:			
Net premiums written	\$ 1,243,027	\$ 1,466,047	\$ 1,345,794
Net premiums earned	\$ 1,302,341	\$ 1,393,180	\$ 1,262,390
Investment income, net	304,678	308,517	259,828
Realized investment gains (losses), net, including net impairment losses	51,934	(12,486)	142,195
Other revenue	49,573	32,315	28,793
Total revenues	1,708,526	1,721,526	1,693,206
Losses and expenses:			
Losses incurred, net	3,379,444	3,071,501	2,365,423
Change in premium deficiency reserves	(261,150)	(756,505)	1,210,841
Underwriting and other expenses	239,612	271,314	309,610
Reinsurance fee	26,407	1,781	
Interest expense	89,266	81,074	41,986
Total losses and expenses	3,473,579	2,669,165	3,927,860
Loss before tax and joint ventures	(1,765,053)	(947,639)	(2,234,654)
Benefit from income tax	(442,776)	(397,798)	(833,977)
Income (loss) from joint ventures, net of tax		24,486	(269,341)
Net loss	\$ (1,322,277)	\$ (525,355)	\$ (1,670,018)
Weighted average common shares outstanding	124,209	113,962	81,294
Diluted loss per share	\$ (10.65)	\$ (4.61)	\$ (20.54)
Dividends per share	\$	\$ 0.075	\$ 0.775

Balance Sheet Data (at year-end) (in thousands, except per share information):

Edgar Filing: MGIC INVESTMENT CORP - Form 424B5

Total investments	\$ 7,254,465	\$ 7,045,536	\$ 5,896,233
Cash and cash equivalents	1,185,739	1,097,334	288,933
Total assets	9,404,419	9,146,734	7,716,361
Loss reserves	6,704,990	4,775,552	2,642,479
Premium deficiency reserves	193,186	454,336	1,210,841
Short-and long-term debt	377,098	698,446	798,250
Convertible debentures	291,785	272,465	
Shareholders equity	1,302,581	2,434,233	2,594,343
Book value per share	10.41	19.46	31.72
New insurance written (in millions):			
Primary insurance	\$ 19,942	\$ 48,230	\$ 76,806
Primary risk	4,149	11,669	19,632
Pool risk(1)	4	145	211

S-7

Table of Contents

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2009	2008	2007
Insurance in force (at year-end) (in millions):			
Direct primary insurance	212,182	226,955	211,745
Direct primary risk	54,343	58,981	55,794
Direct pool risk(1)	1,668	1,902	2,800
Primary loans in default ratios:			
Policies in force	1,360,456	1,472,757	1,437,432
Loans in default	250,440	182,188	107,120
Percentage of loans in default	18.41%	12.37%	7.45%
Percentage of loans in default bulk	40.87%	32.64%	21.91%
Insurance operating ratios (GAAP)(2):			
Loss ratio	259.5%	220.4%	187.3%
Expense ratio	15.1%	14.2%	15.8%
Combined ratio	274.6%	234.6%	203.1%
Risk-to-capital ratio (statutory basis):			
MGIC	19.4:1	12.9:1	10.3:1
Combined insurance companies	22:1:1	14.7:1	11.9:1

(1) Represents contractual aggregate loss limits and, for the years ended December 31, 2009, 2008 and 2007, for \$2.0 billion, \$2.5 billion and \$4.1 billion, respectively, of risk without such limits, risk is calculated at \$0 million, \$1 million, and \$2 million, respectively, for new risk written, and \$190 million, \$150 million and \$475 million, respectively, for risk in force, the estimated amount that would credit enhance these loans to a AA level based on a rating agency model. One of our pool insurance insureds is computing the aggregate loss limit under a pool insurance policy at a higher level than we are computing this limit because we believe the original aggregate limits decreases over time while the insured believes the limit remains constant. At March 31, 2010, the difference was approximately \$420 million and under our interpretation will increase in August 2010 and in August of years thereafter. This difference has had no effect on our results of operations because the aggregate paid losses plus the portion of our loss reserves attributable to this policy have been below our interpretation of the loss limit and is expected to be below that limit for some time. In addition, this difference has had no effect on our pool loss forecasts because we do not include the benefits of aggregate loss limits in those forecasts.

(2) The loss ratio (expressed as a percentage) is the ratio of the sum of incurred losses and loss adjustment expenses to net premiums earned. The expense ratio (expressed as a percentage) is the ratio of the combined insurance operations underwriting expenses to net premiums written.

Table of Contents

RISK FACTORS

You should carefully consider each of the risks described below, together with all of the other information contained or incorporated by reference in this prospectus supplement and the accompanying prospectus, before deciding to invest in shares of our common stock. If any of the following risks develop into actual events, our business, financial condition, results of operations or the market value of our common stock could be materially adversely affected and you may lose all or part of your investment. Some factors in this section are forward-looking statements. For a discussion of those statements, see [Cautionary Statement About Forward-Looking Statements](#) .

Risks Related to Our Business

Even though our plan to write new insurance in MIC has received approval from the Office of the Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin (OCI) and the GSEs, because MGIC is not expected to meet statutory risk-to-capital requirements to write new business in various states, we cannot guarantee that the implementation of our plan will allow us to continue to write new insurance on an uninterrupted basis.

The insurance laws or regulations of 17 states, including Wisconsin, require a mortgage insurer to maintain a minimum amount of statutory capital relative to the risk in force (or a similar measure) in order for the mortgage insurer to continue to write new business. We refer to these requirements as the risk-to-capital requirement. While formulations of minimum capital may vary in certain states, the most common measure applied allows for a maximum permitted risk-to-capital ratio of 25 to 1. At December 31, 2009, MGIC's risk-to-capital ratio was 19.4 to 1. Based upon internal company estimates, MGIC's risk-to-capital ratio over the next few years, after giving effect to any contribution of the proceeds from this offering and the concurrent convertible notes offering to MGIC, could reach 40 to 1 or even higher.

In December 2009, the OCI issued an order waiving, until December 31, 2011, the minimum risk-to-capital ratio. MGIC has also applied for waivers in all other jurisdictions that have risk-to-capital requirements. MGIC has received waivers from some of these states. These waivers expire at various times, with the earliest expiration being December 31, 2010. Some jurisdictions have denied the request because a waiver is not authorized under the jurisdiction's statutes or regulations and others may deny the request on other grounds. The OCI and other state insurance departments, in their sole discretion, may modify, terminate or extend their waivers. If the OCI or other state insurance department modifies or terminates its waiver, or if it fails to renew its waiver after expiration, MGIC would be prevented from writing new business anywhere, in the case of the waiver from the OCI, or in the particular jurisdiction, in the case of the other waivers, if MGIC's risk-to-capital ratio exceeds 25 to 1 unless MGIC raised additional capital to enable it to comply with the risk-to-capital requirement. New insurance written in the states that have risk-to-capital ratio limits represented approximately 50% of new insurance written in 2009. If we were prevented from writing new business, our insurance operations would be in run-off, meaning no new loans would be insured but loans previously insured would continue to be covered, with premiums continuing to be received and losses continuing to be paid, on those loans, until we either met the applicable risk-to-capital requirement or obtained a necessary waiver to allow us to once again write new business.

We cannot assure you that the OCI or any other jurisdiction that has granted a waiver of its risk-to-capital ratio requirements will not modify or revoke the waiver, that it will renew the waiver when it expires or that we could raise additional capital to comply with the risk-to-capital requirement. Depending on the circumstances, the amount of additional capital we might need could be substantial. See [Your ownership in our company may be diluted by additional capital that we raise or if the holders of our outstanding convertible debentures convert their debentures into shares of our common stock](#) .

We are in the final stages of implementing a plan to write new mortgage insurance in MIC in selected jurisdictions in order to address the likelihood that in the future MGIC will not meet the

S-9

Table of Contents

minimum regulatory capital requirements discussed above and may not be able to obtain appropriate waivers of these requirements in all jurisdictions in which minimum requirements are present. In December 2009, the OCI also approved a transaction under which MIC will be eligible to write new mortgage guaranty insurance policies only in jurisdictions where MGIC does not meet minimum capital requirements similar to those waived by the OCI and does not obtain a waiver of those requirements from that jurisdiction's regulatory authority. MIC has received the necessary approvals to write business in all of the jurisdictions in which MGIC would be prohibited from continuing to write new business due to MGIC's failure to meet applicable regulatory capital requirements and obtain waivers of those requirements.

In October 2009, we, MGIC and MIC entered into an agreement with Fannie Mae (the "Fannie Mae Agreement") under which MGIC agreed to contribute \$200 million to MIC (which MGIC has done) and Fannie Mae approved MIC as an eligible mortgage insurer through December 31, 2011 subject to the terms of the Fannie Mae Agreement. Under the Fannie Mae Agreement, MIC will be eligible to write mortgage insurance only in those 16 other jurisdictions in which MGIC cannot write new insurance due to MGIC's failure to meet regulatory capital requirements and if MGIC fails to obtain relief from those requirements or a specified waiver of them. The Fannie Mae Agreement, including certain restrictions imposed on us, MGIC and MIC, is summarized more fully in, and included as an exhibit to, our Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC") on October 16, 2009.

On February 11, 2010, Freddie Mac notified (the "Freddie Mac Notification") MGIC that it may utilize MIC to write new business in states in which MGIC does not meet minimum regulatory capital requirements to write new business and does not obtain appropriate waivers of those requirements. This conditional approval to use MIC as a "Limited Insurer" will expire December 31, 2012. This conditional approval includes terms substantially similar to those in the Fannie Mae Agreement and is summarized more fully in our Form 8-K filed with the SEC on February 16, 2010.

Under the Fannie Mae Agreement, Fannie Mae approved MIC as an eligible mortgage insurer only through December 31, 2011 and Freddie Mac has approved MIC as a "Limited Insurer" only through December 31, 2012. Whether MIC will continue as an eligible mortgage insurer after these dates will be determined by the applicable GSE's mortgage insurer eligibility requirements then in effect. For more information, see "MGIC may not continue to meet the GSEs' mortgage insurer eligibility requirements". Further, under the Fannie Mae Agreement and the Freddie Mac Notification, MGIC cannot capitalize MIC with more than the \$200 million contribution without prior approval from each GSE, which limits the amount of business MIC can write. We believe that the amount of capital that MGIC has contributed to MIC will be sufficient to write business for the term of the Fannie Mae Agreement in the jurisdictions in which MIC is eligible to do so. Depending on the level of losses that MGIC experiences in the future, however, it is possible that regulatory action by one or more jurisdictions, including those that do not have specific regulatory capital requirements applicable to mortgage insurers, may prevent MGIC from continuing to write new insurance in some or all of the jurisdictions in which MIC is not eligible to write business.

A failure to meet the specific minimum regulatory capital requirements to insure new business does not necessarily mean that MGIC does not have sufficient resources to pay claims on its insurance liabilities. While we believe that we have claims paying resources at MGIC that exceed our claim obligations on our insurance in force, even in scenarios in which we fail to meet regulatory capital requirements, we cannot assure you that the events that lead to us failing to meet regulatory capital requirements would not also result in our not having sufficient claims paying resources. Furthermore, our estimates of our claims paying resources and claim obligations are based on various assumptions. These assumptions include our anticipated rescission activity, future housing values and future unemployment rates. These assumptions are subject to inherent uncertainty and require judgment by management. Current conditions in the domestic economy make the assumptions about housing values and unemployment highly volatile in the sense that there is a wide range of reasonably possible outcomes. Our anticipated rescission activity is also subject to inherent uncertainty due to the difficulty of predicting the amount of claims that will be rescinded and the outcome of any dispute resolution proceedings related to rescissions that we make.

Table of Contents

We have reported net losses for the last three years, expect to continue to report net losses, and cannot assure you when we will return to profitability.

For the years ended December 31, 2009, 2008 and 2007, respectively, we had a net loss of \$1.3 billion, \$0.5 billion and \$1.7 billion. We believe the size of our future net losses will depend primarily on the amount of our incurred and paid losses and to a lesser extent on the amount and profitability of our new business. Our incurred and paid losses are dependent on factors that make prediction of their amounts difficult and any forecasts are subject to significant volatility. We currently expect to incur substantial losses for 2010 and losses in declining amounts thereafter. Among the assumptions underlying our forecasts are that loan modification programs will only modestly mitigate losses; that the cure rate steadily improves but does not return to historic norms until early 2013; and there is no change to our current rescission practices. In this latter regard, see [Item 1](#). We may not continue to realize benefits from rescissions at the levels we have recently experienced and we may not prevail in proceedings challenging whether our rescissions were proper. Although we currently expect to return to profitability, we cannot assure you when, or if, this will occur. During the last few years our ability to forecast accurately future results has been limited due to significant volatility in many of the factors that go into our forecasts. The net losses we have experienced have eroded, and any future net losses will erode, our shareholders' equity and could result in equity being negative.

We may not continue to realize benefits from rescissions at the levels we have recently experienced and we may not prevail in proceedings challenging whether our rescissions were proper.

Historically, claims submitted to us on policies we rescinded were not a material portion of our claims resolved during a year. However, beginning in 2008, our rescissions of policies have materially mitigated our paid losses. In 2009, rescissions mitigated our paid losses by \$1.2 billion and in the first quarter of 2010, rescissions mitigated our paid losses by \$373 million (both of these figures include amounts that would have either resulted in a claim payment or been charged to a deductible under a bulk or pool policy, and may have been charged to a captive reinsurer). While we have a substantial pipeline of claims investigations that we expect will eventually result in future rescissions, we can give no assurance that rescissions will continue to mitigate paid losses at the same level we have recently experienced.

In addition, our loss reserving methodology incorporates the effects we expect rescission activity to have on the losses we will pay on our delinquent inventory. A variance between ultimate actual rescission rates and these estimates, as result of litigation, settlements or other factors, could materially affect our losses. See [Item 1](#). Because loss reserve estimates are subject to uncertainties and are based on assumptions that are currently very volatile, paid claims may be substantially different than our loss reserves. We estimate rescissions mitigated our incurred losses by approximately \$2.5 billion in 2009, compared to \$0.6 billion in the first quarter of 2010; both of these figures include the benefit of claims not paid as well as the impact on our loss reserves. In recent quarters, approximately 25% of claims received in a quarter have been resolved by rescissions. At March 31, 2010, we had 241,244 loans in our primary delinquency inventory; the resolution of a material portion of these loans will not involve claims.

If the insured disputes our right to rescind coverage, whether the requirements to rescind are met ultimately would be determined by legal proceedings. Objections to rescission may be made several years after we have rescinded an insurance policy. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. and an affiliate (Countrywide) filed a lawsuit against MGIC alleging that MGIC denied, and continues to deny, valid mortgage insurance claims. We filed an arbitration case against Countrywide regarding rescissions and Countrywide has responded seeking material damages. For more information about this lawsuit and arbitration case, see [Item 1](#). We are subject to the risk of private litigation and regulatory proceedings. In addition, we continue to discuss with other lenders their objections to material rescissions and are involved in other arbitration proceedings with respect to rescissions that are not collectively material in amount.

Table of Contents

We are subject to the risk of private litigation and regulatory proceedings.

Consumers are bringing a growing number of lawsuits against home mortgage lenders and settlement service providers. Seven mortgage insurers, including MGIC, have been involved in litigation alleging violations of the anti-referral fee provisions of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, which is commonly known as RESPA, and the notice provisions of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, which is commonly known as FCRA. MGIC's settlement of class action litigation against it under RESPA became final in October 2003. MGIC settled the named plaintiffs' claims in litigation against it under FCRA in late December 2004 following denial of class certification in June 2004. Since December 2006, class action litigation was separately brought against a number of large lenders alleging that their captive mortgage reinsurance arrangements violated RESPA. While we are not a defendant in any of these cases, there can be no assurance that we will not be subject to future litigation under RESPA or FCRA or that the outcome of any such litigation would not have a material adverse effect on us.

We are subject to comprehensive, detailed regulation by state insurance departments. These regulations are principally designed for the protection of our insured policyholders, rather than for the benefit of investors. Although their scope varies, state insurance laws generally grant broad supervisory powers to agencies or officials to examine insurance companies and enforce rules or exercise discretion affecting almost every significant aspect of the insurance business. Given the recent significant losses incurred by many insurers in the mortgage and financial guaranty industries, our insurance subsidiaries have been subject to heightened scrutiny by insurance regulators. State insurance regulatory authorities could take actions, including changes in capital requirements or termination of waivers of capital requirements, that could have a material adverse effect on us.

In June 2005, in response to a letter from the New York Insurance Department, we provided information regarding captive mortgage reinsurance arrangements and other types of arrangements in which lenders receive compensation. In February 2006, the New York Insurance Department requested MGIC to review its premium rates in New York and to file adjusted rates based on recent years' experience or to explain why such experience would not alter rates. In March 2006, MGIC advised the New York Insurance Department that it believes its premium rates are reasonable and that, given the nature of mortgage insurance risk, premium rates should not be determined only by the experience of recent years. In February 2006, in response to an administrative subpoena from the Minnesota Department of Commerce, which regulates insurance, we provided the Department with information about captive mortgage reinsurance and certain other matters. We subsequently provided additional information to the Minnesota Department of Commerce, and beginning in March 2008 that Department has sought additional information as well as answers to questions regarding captive mortgage reinsurance on several occasions. In addition, beginning in June 2008, we have received subpoenas from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, commonly referred to as HUD, seeking information about captive mortgage reinsurance similar to that requested by the Minnesota Department of Commerce, but not limited in scope to the state of Minnesota. Other insurance departments or other officials, including attorneys general, may also seek information about or investigate captive mortgage reinsurance.

The anti-referral fee provisions of RESPA provide that HUD as well as the insurance commissioner or attorney general of any state may bring an action to enjoin violations of these provisions of RESPA. The insurance law provisions of many states prohibit paying for the referral of insurance business and provide various mechanisms to enforce this prohibition. While we believe our captive reinsurance arrangements are in conformity with applicable laws and regulations, it is not possible to predict the outcome of any such reviews or investigations nor is it possible to predict their effect on us or the mortgage insurance industry.

Since October 2007 we have been involved in an investigation conducted by the Division of Enforcement of the SEC. The investigation appears to involve disclosure and financial reporting by us and by a co-investor regarding our respective investments in our C-BASS joint venture. We have

Table of Contents

provided documents to the SEC and a number of our executive officers, as well as other employees, have testified. This matter is ongoing and no assurance can be given that the SEC staff will not recommend an enforcement action against our company or one or more of our executive officers or other employees.

Five previously-filed purported class action complaints filed against us and several of our executive officers were consolidated in March 2009 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin and Fulton County Employees Retirement System was appointed as the lead plaintiff. The lead plaintiff filed a Consolidated Class Action Complaint (the Complaint) on June 22, 2009. Due in part to its length and structure, it is difficult to summarize briefly the allegations in the Complaint but it appears the allegations are that we and our officers named in the Complaint violated the federal securities laws by misrepresenting or failing to disclose material information about (i) loss development in our insurance in force, and (ii) C-BASS, including its liquidity. Our motion to dismiss the Complaint was granted on February 18, 2010. On March 18, 2010, plaintiffs filed a motion for leave to file an amended complaint. Attached to this motion was a proposed Amended Complaint (the Amended Complaint). The Amended Complaint alleges that we and two of our officers named in the Amended Complaint violated the federal securities laws by misrepresenting or failing to disclose material information about C-BASS, including its liquidity, and by failing to properly account for our investment in C-BASS. The Amended Complaint also names two officers of C-BASS with respect to the Amended Complaint's allegations regarding C-BASS. The purported class period covered by the Complaint begins on February 6, 2007 and ends on August 13, 2007. The Amended Complaint seeks damages based on purchases of our stock during this time period at prices that were allegedly inflated as a result of the purported violations of federal securities laws. On April 12, 2010, we filed a motion in opposition to Plaintiff's motion for leave to amend its complaint. With limited exceptions, our bylaws provide that our officers are entitled to indemnification from us for claims against them of the type alleged in the Amended Complaint. We are unable to predict the outcome of these consolidated cases or estimate our associated expenses or possible losses. Other lawsuits alleging violations of the securities laws could be brought against us.

Several law firms have issued press releases to the effect that they are investigating us, including whether the fiduciaries of our 401(k) plan breached their fiduciary duties regarding the plan's investment in or holding of our common stock or whether we breached other legal or fiduciary obligations to our shareholders. With limited exceptions, our bylaws provide that our officers and 401(k) plan fiduciaries are entitled to indemnification from us for claims against them. We intend to defend vigorously any proceedings that may result from these investigations.

As we previously disclosed, for some time we have had discussions with lenders regarding their objections to rescissions that in the aggregate are material. On December 17, 2009, Countrywide filed a complaint for declaratory relief in the Superior Court of the State of California in San Francisco against MGIC. This complaint alleges that MGIC has denied, and continues to deny, valid mortgage insurance claims submitted by Countrywide and says it seeks declaratory relief regarding the proper interpretation of the flow insurance policies at issue. On January 19, 2010, we removed this case to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. On March 30, 2010, the Court ordered the case remanded to the Superior Court of the State of California in San Francisco. We have asked the Court to stay the remand and plan to appeal this decision. On February 24, 2010, we commenced an arbitration action against Countrywide seeking a determination that MGIC was entitled to deny and/or rescind coverage on the loans involved in the arbitration demand, which numbered more than 1,400 loans as of the filing of the demand. On March 16, 2010, Countrywide filed a response to our arbitration action objecting to the arbitrator's jurisdiction in view of the case initiated by Countrywide in the Superior Court of the State of California and asserting various defenses to the relief sought by MGIC in the arbitration. The response also seeks damages of at least \$150 million, exclusive of interest and costs, as a result of purported breaches of flow insurance policies issued by MGIC and additional damages, including exemplary damages, on account of MGIC's purported breach of an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. We intend to defend MGIC against Countrywide's

Table of Contents

complaint and arbitration response, and to pursue MGIC's claims in the arbitration, vigorously. However, we are unable to predict the outcome of these proceedings or their effect on us.

In addition to the rescissions at issue with Countrywide, we have a substantial pipeline of claims investigations (including investigations involving loans related to Countrywide) that we expect will eventually result in future rescissions. For additional information about rescissions, see [Item 1](#). We may not continue to realize benefits from rescissions at the levels we have recently experienced and we may not prevail in proceedings challenging whether our rescissions were proper.

Changes in the business practices of the GSEs, federal legislation that changes their charters or a restructuring of the GSEs could reduce our revenues or increase our losses.

The majority of our insurance written is for loans sold to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The business practices of the GSEs affect the entire relationship between them and mortgage insurers and include:

- the level of private mortgage insurance coverage, subject to the limitations of the GSEs' charters (which may be changed by federal legislation) when private mortgage insurance is used as the required credit enhancement on low down payment mortgages,

- the amount of loan level delivery fees (which result in higher costs to borrowers) that the GSEs assess on loans that require mortgage insurance,

- whether the GSEs influence the mortgage lender's selection of the mortgage insurer providing coverage and, if so, any transactions that are related to that selection,

- the underwriting standards that determine what loans are eligible for purchase by the GSEs, which can affect the quality of the risk insured by the mortgage insurer and the availability of mortgage loans,

- the terms on which mortgage insurance coverage can be canceled before reaching the cancellation thresholds established by law, and

- the programs established by the GSEs intended to avoid or mitigate loss on insured mortgages and the circumstances in which mortgage servicers must implement such programs.

In September 2008, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) was appointed as the conservator of the GSEs. As their conservator, FHFA controls and directs the operations of the GSEs. The appointment of FHFA as conservator, the increasing role that the federal government has assumed in the residential mortgage market, our industry's inability, due to capital constraints, to write sufficient business to meet the needs of the GSEs or other factors may increase the likelihood that the business practices of the GSEs change in ways that may have a material adverse effect on us. In addition, these factors may increase the likelihood that the charters of the GSEs are changed by new federal legislation. Such changes may allow the GSEs to reduce or eliminate the level of private mortgage insurance coverage that they use as credit enhancement, which could have a material adverse effect on our revenue, results of operations or financial condition. The Obama administration and certain members of Congress have publicly stated that they are considering proposing significant changes to the GSEs. As a result, it is uncertain what role that the GSEs will play in the domestic residential housing finance system in the future or the impact of any such changes on our business.

For a number of years, the GSEs have had programs under which on certain loans lenders could choose a mortgage insurance coverage percentage that was only the minimum required by their charters, with the GSEs paying a lower

price for these loans (charter coverage). The GSEs have also had programs under which on certain loans they would accept a level of mortgage insurance above the requirements of their charters but below their standard coverage without any decrease in the purchase price they would pay for these loans (reduced coverage). Effective January 1, 2010, Fannie Mae broadly expanded the types of loans eligible for charter coverage and in the second

Table of Contents

quarter of 2010 Fannie Mae eliminated its reduced coverage program. In recent years, a majority of our volume was on loans with GSE standard coverage, a substantial portion of our volume has been on loans with reduced coverage, and a minor portion of our volume has been on loans with charter coverage. We charge higher premium rates for higher coverages. During the first quarter of 2010, the portion of our volume insured at charter coverage has been approximately the same as in the recent years and, due in part to the elimination of reduced coverage by Fannie Mae, the portion of our volume insured at standard coverage has increased. Also, the pricing changes we plan to implement on May 1, 2010 (see The premiums we charge may not be adequate to compensate us for our liabilities for losses and as a result any inadequacy could materially affect our financial condition and results of operations) would eliminate a lender's incentive to use Fannie Mae charter coverage in place of standard coverage. However, to the extent lenders selling loans to Fannie Mae in the future did choose charter coverage for loans that we insure, our revenues would be reduced and we could experience other adverse effects.

Both of the GSEs have policies which provide guidelines on terms under which they can conduct business with mortgage insurers, such as MGIC, with financial strength ratings below Aa3/AA-. (MGIC's financial strength rating from Moody's is Ba3, with a negative outlook; from Standard & Poor's is B+, with a negative outlook; and from Fitch Ratings Service is BB-, with a negative outlook.) For information about how these policies could affect us, see MGIC may not continue to meet the GSEs' mortgage insurer eligibility requirements .

MGIC may not continue to meet the GSEs' mortgage insurer eligibility requirements.

The majority of our insurance written is for loans sold to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, each of which has mortgage insurer eligibility requirements. We believe that the GSEs are analyzing their mortgage insurer eligibility requirements and may make changes to them in the near future. Currently, MGIC is operating with each GSE as an eligible insurer under a remediation plan. We believe that the GSEs view remediation plans as a continuing process of interaction between a mortgage insurer and MGIC will continue to operate under a remediation plan for the foreseeable future. There can be no assurance that MGIC will be able to continue to operate as an eligible mortgage insurer under a remediation plan. If MGIC ceases being eligible to insure loans purchased by one or both of the GSEs, it would significantly reduce the volume of our new business writings.

The amount of insurance we write could be adversely affected if lenders and investors select alternatives to private mortgage insurance.

These alternatives to private mortgage insurance include:

lenders using government mortgage insurance programs, including those of the Federal Housing Administration, or FHA, and the Veterans Administration,

lenders and other investors holding mortgages in portfolio and self-insuring,

investors using credit enhancements other than private mortgage insurance, using other credit enhancements in conjunction with reduced levels of private mortgage insurance coverage, or accepting credit risk without credit enhancement, and

lenders originating mortgages using piggyback structures to avoid private mortgage insurance, such as a first mortgage with an 80% loan-to-value ratio and a second mortgage with a 10%, 15% or 20% loan-to-value ratio (referred to as 80-10-10, 80-15-5 or 80-20 loans, respectively) rather than a first mortgage with a 90%, 95% or 100% loan-to-value ratio that has private mortgage insurance.

The FHA substantially increased its market share beginning in 2008. We believe that the FHA's market share increased, in part, because mortgage insurers have tightened their underwriting guidelines (which has led to increased utilization of the FHA's programs) and because of increases in the amount of loan level delivery fees that the GSEs assess on loans (which result in higher costs to

Table of Contents

borrowers). Recent federal legislation and programs have also provided the FHA with greater flexibility in establishing new products and have increased the FHA's competitive position against private mortgage insurers.

Competition or changes in our relationships with our customers could reduce our revenues or increase our losses.

In recent years, the level of competition within the private mortgage insurance industry has been intense as many large mortgage lenders reduced the number of private mortgage insurers with whom they do business. At the same time, consolidation among mortgage lenders has increased the share of the mortgage lending market held by large lenders. Our private mortgage insurance competitors include:

PMI Mortgage Insurance Company,

Genworth Mortgage Insurance Corporation,

United Guaranty Residential Insurance Company,

Radian Guaranty Inc.,

Republic Mortgage Insurance Company, whose parent, based on information filed with the SEC through April 12, 2010, is our largest shareholder, and

CMG Mortgage Insurance Company.

Until recently, the mortgage insurance industry had not had new entrants in many years. Recently, Essent Guaranty, Inc. announced that it would begin writing new mortgage insurance. Essent has publicly reported that one of its investors is JPMorgan Chase which is one of our customers. The perceived increase in credit quality of loans that are being insured today combined with the deterioration of the financial strength ratings of the existing mortgage insurance companies could encourage new entrants. We understand that one potential new entrant has advertised for employees. The FHA, which in recent years was not viewed by us as a significant competitor, substantially increased its market share beginning in 2008.

Our relationships with our customers could be adversely affected by a variety of factors, including tightening of and adherence to our underwriting guidelines, which have resulted in our declining to insure some of the loans originated by our customers, rescission of loans that affect the customer and our decision to discontinue ceding new business under excess of loss captive reinsurance programs. In the fourth quarter of 2009, Countrywide commenced litigation against us as a result of its dissatisfaction with our rescissions practices shortly after Countrywide ceased doing business with us. See We are subject to the risk of private litigation and regulatory proceedings for more information about this litigation and the arbitration case we filed against Countrywide regarding rescissions. Countrywide and its Bank of America affiliates accounted for 12.0% of our flow new insurance written in 2008 and 8.3% of our new insurance written in the first three quarters of 2009. In addition, we continue to have discussions with other lenders who are significant customers regarding their objections to rescissions.

We believe some lenders assess a mortgage insurer's financial strength rating as an important element of the process through which they select mortgage insurers. MGIC's financial strength rating from Moody's is Ba3, with a negative outlook; from Standard & Poor's is B+, with a negative outlook; and from Fitch Ratings Service is BB-, with a negative outlook. Absent additional capital, it is possible that MGIC's financial strength ratings could decline from these levels. As a result of MGIC's less than investment grade financial strength rating, MGIC may be competitively disadvantaged with these lenders.

Table of Contents***Downturns in the domestic economy or declines in the value of borrowers' homes from their value at the time their loans closed may result in more homeowners defaulting and our losses increasing.***

Losses result from events that reduce a borrower's ability to continue to make mortgage payments, such as unemployment, and whether the home of a borrower who defaults on his mortgage can be sold for an amount that will cover unpaid principal and interest and the expenses of the sale. In general, favorable economic conditions reduce the likelihood that borrowers will lack sufficient income to pay their mortgages and also favorably affect the value of homes, thereby reducing and in some cases even eliminating a loss from a mortgage default. A deterioration in economic conditions, including an increase in unemployment, generally increases the likelihood that borrowers will not have sufficient income to pay their mortgages and can also adversely affect housing values, which in turn can influence the willingness of borrowers with sufficient resources to make mortgage payments to do so when the mortgage balance exceeds the value of the home. Housing values may decline even absent a deterioration in economic conditions due to declines in demand for homes, which in turn may result from changes in buyers' perceptions of the potential for future appreciation, restrictions on and the cost of mortgage credit due to more stringent underwriting standards, liquidity issues affecting lenders or higher interest rates generally or other factors. The residential mortgage market in the United States has for some time experienced a variety of poor or worsening economic conditions, including a material nationwide decline in housing values, with declines continuing in 2010 in a number of geographic areas. Home values may continue to deteriorate and unemployment levels may continue to increase or remain elevated.

The mix of business we write also affects the likelihood of losses occurring.

Even when housing values are stable or rising, certain types of mortgages have higher probabilities of claims. These types include loans with loan-to-value ratios over 95% (or in certain markets that have experienced declining housing values, over 90%), FICO credit scores below 620, limited underwriting, including limited borrower documentation, or total debt-to-income ratios of 38% or higher, as well as loans having combinations of higher risk factors. As of March 31, 2010, approximately 60% of our primary risk in force consisted of loans with loan-to-value ratios equal to or greater than 95%, 9.10% had FICO credit scores below 620, and 12.2% had limited underwriting, including limited borrower documentation. A material portion of these loans were written in 2005–2007 or the first quarter of 2008. (In accordance with industry practice, loans approved by GSEs and other automated underwriting systems under "doc waiver" programs that do not require verification of borrower income are classified by us as "full documentation." For additional information about such loans, see Note 8 to our consolidated financial statements in Item 8 of our annual report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2009.)

Beginning in the fourth quarter of 2007 we made a series of changes to our underwriting guidelines in an effort to improve the risk profile of our new business. Requirements imposed by new guidelines, however, only affect business written under commitments to insure loans that are issued after those guidelines become effective. Business for which commitments are issued after new guidelines are announced and before they become effective is insured by us in accordance with the guidelines in effect at time of the commitment even if that business would not meet the new guidelines. For commitments we issue for loans that close and are insured by us, a period longer than a calendar quarter can elapse between the time we issue a commitment to insure a loan and the time we report the loan in our risk in force, although this period is generally shorter.

From time to time, in response to market conditions, we increase or decrease the types of loans that we insure. In addition, we make exceptions to our underwriting guidelines on a loan-by-loan basis and for certain customer programs. Together these exceptions accounted for less than 5% of the loans we insured in recent quarters. The changes to our underwriting guidelines since the fourth quarter of 2007 include the creation of two tiers of "restricted markets." Our underwriting criteria for restricted markets do not allow insurance to be written on certain loans that could be insured if the

Table of Contents

property were located in an unrestricted market. Beginning in September 2009, we removed several markets from our restricted markets list and moved several other markets from our Tier Two restricted market list (for which our underwriting guidelines are most limiting) to our Tier One restricted market list. In addition, we have made other changes that have relaxed our underwriting guidelines and expect to continue to make changes in appropriate circumstances that will do so in the future.

As of March 31, 2010, approximately 3.5% of our primary risk in force written through the flow channel, and 41.0% of our primary risk in force written through the bulk channel, consisted of adjustable rate mortgages in which the initial interest rate may be adjusted during the five years after the mortgage closing (ARMs). We classify as fixed rate loans adjustable rate mortgages in which the initial interest rate is fixed during the five years after the mortgage closing. We believe that when the reset interest rate significantly exceeds the interest rate at loan origination, claims on ARMs would be substantially higher than for fixed rate loans. Moreover, even if interest rates remain unchanged, claims on ARMs with a teaser rate (an initial interest rate that does not fully reflect the index which determines subsequent rates) may also be substantially higher because of the increase in the mortgage payment that will occur when the fully indexed rate becomes effective. In addition, we have insured interest-only loans, which may also be ARMs, and loans with negative amortization features, such as pay option ARMs. We believe claim rates on these loans will be substantially higher than on loans without scheduled payment increases that are made to borrowers of comparable credit quality.

Although we attempt to incorporate these higher expected claim rates into our underwriting and pricing models, there can be no assurance that the premiums earned and the associated investment income will be adequate to compensate for actual losses even under our current underwriting guidelines. We do, however, believe that given the various changes in our underwriting guidelines that were effective beginning in the first quarter of 2008, our insurance written beginning in the second quarter of 2008 will generate underwriting profits.

Because we establish loss reserves only upon a loan default rather than based on estimates of our ultimate losses, losses may have a disproportionate adverse effect on our earnings in certain periods.

In accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, commonly referred to as GAAP, we establish loss reserves only for loans in default. Reserves are established for reported insurance losses and loss adjustment expenses based on when notices of default on insured mortgage loans are received. Reserves are also established for estimated losses incurred on notices of default that have not yet been reported to us by the servicers (this is often referred to as IBNR). We establish reserves using estimated claims rates and claims amounts in estimating the ultimate loss. Because our reserving method does not take account of the impact of future losses that could occur from loans that are not delinquent, our obligation for ultimate losses that we expect to occur under our policies in force at any period end is not reflected in our financial statements, except in the case where a premium deficiency exists. As a result, future losses may have a material impact on future results as losses emerge.

Because loss reserve estimates are subject to uncertainties and are based on assumptions that are currently very volatile, paid claims may be substantially different than our loss reserves.

We establish reserves using estimated claim rates and claim amounts in estimating the ultimate loss on delinquent loans. The estimated claim rates and claim amounts represent our best estimates of what we will actually pay on the loans in default as of the reserve date and incorporates anticipated mitigation from rescissions.

The establishment of loss reserves is subject to inherent uncertainty and requires judgment by management. Current conditions in the housing and mortgage industries make the assumptions that we use to establish loss reserves more volatile than they would otherwise be. The actual amount of

Table of Contents

the claim payments may be substantially different than our loss reserve estimates. Our estimates could be adversely affected by several factors, including a deterioration of regional or national economic conditions, including unemployment, leading to a reduction in borrowers' income and thus their ability to make mortgage payments, a drop in housing values that could materially reduce our ability to mitigate potential loss through property acquisition and resale or expose us to greater loss on resale of properties obtained through the claim settlement process and mitigation from rescissions being materially less than assumed. Changes to our estimates could result in material impact to our results of operations, even in a stable economic environment, and there can be no assurance that actual claims paid by us will not be substantially different than our loss reserves.

The premiums we charge may not be adequate to compensate us for our liabilities for losses and as a result any inadequacy could materially affect our financial condition and results of operations.

We set premiums at the time a policy is issued based on our expectations regarding likely performance over the long-term. Our premiums are subject to approval by state regulatory agencies, which can delay or limit our ability to increase our premiums. Generally, we cannot cancel the mortgage insurance coverage or adjust renewal premiums during the life of a mortgage insurance policy. As a result, higher than anticipated claims generally cannot be offset by premium increases on policies in force or mitigated by our non-renewal or cancellation of insurance coverage. The premiums we charge, and the associated investment income, may not be adequate to compensate us for the risks and costs associated with the insurance coverage provided to customers. An increase in the number or size of claims, compared to what we anticipate, could adversely affect our results of operations or financial condition.

Subject to regulatory approval, effective May 1, 2010, we will price our new insurance written after considering, among other things, the borrower's credit score. We made these rate changes to be more competitive with insurance programs offered by the FHA. Had these rate changes been in place with respect to new insurance written in the second half of 2009 and the first quarter of 2010, they would have resulted in lower premiums being charged for a substantial majority of our new insurance written. However, during the first quarter of 2010 (continuing a trend that began in the fourth quarter of 2009), the average coverage percentage of our new insurance written increased. We believe the increased coverage was due in part to the elimination of Fannie Mae's reduced coverage program. See

Changes in the business practices of the GSEs, federal legislation that changes their charters or a restructuring of the GSEs could reduce our revenues or increase our losses. Because we charge higher premiums for higher coverages, had our reduced premium rates been in effect during the first quarter, the effect of lower premium rates would have been largely offset by the increase in premiums due to higher coverages. We cannot predict whether our new business written in the future will continue to have higher coverages. For more information about our rate changes, see our Form 8-K that was filed with the SEC on February 23, 2010.

In January 2008, we announced that we had decided to stop writing the portion of our bulk business that insures loans which are included in Wall Street securitizations because the performance of loans included in such securitizations deteriorated materially in the fourth quarter of 2007 and this deterioration was materially worse than we experienced for loans insured through the flow channel or loans insured through the remainder of our bulk channel. As of December 31, 2007 we established a premium deficiency reserve of approximately \$1.2 billion. As of March 31, 2010, the premium deficiency reserve was \$180 million. At each date, the premium deficiency reserve is the present value of expected future losses and expenses that exceeded the present value of expected future premium and already established loss reserves on these bulk transactions.

The mortgage insurance industry is experiencing material losses, especially on the 2006 and 2007 books. The ultimate amount of these losses will depend in part on general economic conditions, including unemployment, and the direction of home prices, which in turn will be influenced by general economic conditions and other factors. Because we cannot predict future home prices or general

Table of Contents

economic conditions with confidence, there is significant uncertainty surrounding what our ultimate losses will be on our 2006 and 2007 books. Our current expectation, however, is that these books will continue to generate material incurred and paid losses for a number of years. There can be no assurance that additional premium deficiency reserves on Wall Street Bulk or on other portions of our insurance portfolio will not be required.

Loan modification and other similar programs may not provide material benefits to us and our losses on loans that re-default can be higher than what we would have paid had the loan not been modified.

Beginning in the fourth quarter of 2008, the federal government, including through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (the FDIC) and the GSEs, and several lenders have adopted programs to modify loans to make them more affordable to borrowers with the goal of reducing the number of foreclosures. For the quarter ending March 31, 2010, we were notified of modifications involving loans with risk in force of approximately \$734 million.

One such program is the Home Affordable Modification Program (HAMP), which was announced by the US Treasury in early 2009. Some of HAMP 's eligibility criteria require current information about borrowers, such as his or her current income and non-mortgage debt payments. Because the GSEs and servicers do not share such information with us, we cannot determine with certainty the number of loans in our delinquent inventory that are eligible to participate in HAMP. We believe that it could take several months from the time a borrower has made all of the payments during HAMP 's three month trial modification period for the loan to be reported to us as a cured delinquency. We are aware of approximately 43,100 loans in our primary delinquent inventory at March 31, 2010 for which the HAMP trial period has begun and approximately 11,600 delinquent primary loans have cured their delinquency after entering HAMP. We rely on information provided to us by the GSEs and servicers. We do not receive all of the information from such sources that is required to determine with certainty the number of loans that are participating in, or have successfully completed, HAMP.

Under HAMP, a net present value test (the NPV Test) is used to determine if loan modifications will be offered. For loans owned or guaranteed by the GSEs, servicers may, depending on the results of the NPV Test and other factors, be required to offer loan modifications, as defined by HAMP, to borrowers. As of December 1, 2009, the GSEs changed how the NPV Test is used. These changes made it more difficult for some loans to be modified under HAMP. While we lack sufficient data to determine the impact of these changes, we believe that they may materially decrease the number of our loans that will participate in HAMP. In January 2010 the United States Treasury department has further modified the HAMP eligibility requirements. Effective June 1, 2010 a servicer may evaluate and initiate a HAMP trial modification for a borrower only after the servicer receives certain documents that allow the servicer to verify the borrower 's income and the cause of the borrower 's financial hardship. Previously, these documents were not required to be submitted until after the successful completion of HAMP 's trial modification period. We believe that this will decrease the number of new HAMP trial modifications.

The effect on us of loan modifications depends on how many modified loans subsequently re-default, which in turn can be affected by changes in housing values. Re-defaults can result in losses for us that could be greater than we would have paid had the loan not been modified. At this point, we cannot predict with a high degree of confidence what the ultimate re-default rate will be, and therefore we cannot ascertain with confidence whether these programs will provide material benefits to us. In addition, because we do not have information in our database for all of the parameters used to determine which loans are eligible for modification programs, our estimates of the number of loans qualifying for modification programs are inherently uncertain. If legislation is enacted to permit a mortgage balance to be reduced in bankruptcy, we would still be responsible to pay the original balance if the borrower re-defaulted on that mortgage after its balance had been reduced. Various government entities and private parties have enacted foreclosure (or equivalent) moratoriums. Such a moratorium does not affect the accrual of interest and other expenses on a loan. Unless a loan is

Table of Contents

modified during a moratorium to cure the default, at the expiration of the moratorium additional interest and expenses would be due which could result in our losses on loans subject to the moratorium being higher than if there had been no moratorium.

Eligibility under loan modification programs can also adversely affect us by creating an incentive for borrowers who are able to make their mortgage payments to become delinquent in an attempt to obtain the benefits of a modification. New notices of delinquency are a factor that increases our incurred losses.

If interest rates decline, house prices appreciate or mortgage insurance cancellation requirements change, the length of time that our policies remain in force could decline and result in declines in our revenue.

In each year, most of our premiums are from insurance that has been written in prior years. As a result, the length of time insurance remains in force, which is also generally referred to as persistency, is a significant determinant of our revenues. The factors affecting the length of time our insurance remains in force include:

the level of current mortgage interest rates compared to the mortgage coupon rates on the insurance in force, which affects the vulnerability of the insurance in force to refinancings, and

mortgage insurance cancellation policies of mortgage investors along with the current value of the homes underlying the mortgages in the insurance in force.

During the 1990s, our year-end persistency ranged from a high of 87.4% at December 31, 1990 to a low of 68.1% at December 31, 1998. Since 2000, our year-end persistency ranged from a high of 84.7% at December 31, 2009 to a low of 47.1% at December 31, 2003. Future premiums on our insurance in force represent a material portion of our claims paying resources.

Your ownership in our company may be diluted by additional capital that we raise or if the holders of our outstanding convertible debentures convert their debentures into shares of our common stock.

As noted above under Even though our plan to write new insurance in MIC has received approval from the Office of the Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin (OCI) and the GSEs, because MGIC is not expected to meet statutory risk-to-capital requirements to write new business in various states, we cannot guarantee that the implementation of our plan will allow us to continue to write new insurance on an uninterrupted basis , we may be required to raise additional equity capital. Any such future sales would dilute your ownership interest in our company. In addition, the market price of our common stock could decline as a result of sales of a large number of shares or similar securities in the market or the perception that such sales could occur.

We have approximately \$390 million principal amount of 9% Convertible Junior Subordinated Debentures outstanding. The principal amount of the debentures is currently convertible, at the holder s option, at an initial conversion rate, which is subject to adjustment, of 74.0741 common shares per \$1,000 principal amount of debentures. This represents an initial conversion price of approximately \$13.50 per share. We have elected to defer the payment of a total of approximately \$55 million of interest on these debentures. We may also defer additional interest in the future. If a holder elects to convert its debentures, the interest that has been deferred on the debentures being converted is also converted into shares of our common stock. The conversion rate for such deferred interest is based on the average price that our shares traded at during a 5-day period immediately prior to the election to convert the associated debentures.

Table of Contents

If the volume of low down payment home mortgage originations declines, the amount of insurance that we write could decline, which would reduce our revenues.

The factors that affect the volume of low-down-payment mortgage originations include:

- restrictions on mortgage credit due to more stringent underwriting standards and liquidity issues affecting lenders,
- the level of home mortgage interest rates,
- the health of the domestic economy as well as conditions in regional and local economies,
- housing affordability,
- population trends, including the rate of household formation,
- the rate of home price appreciation, which in times of heavy refinancing can affect whether refinance loans have loan-to-value ratios that require private mortgage insurance, and
- government housing policy encouraging loans to first-time homebuyers.

A decline in the volume of low down payment home mortgage originations could decrease demand for mortgage insurance, decrease our new insurance written and reduce our revenues.

The Internal Revenue Service has proposed significant adjustments to our taxable income for 2000 through 2007.

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has completed separate examinations of our federal income tax returns for the years 2000 through 2004 and 2005 through 2007 and has issued assessments for unpaid taxes, interest and penalties. The primary adjustment in both examinations relates to our treatment of the flow through income and loss from an investment in a portfolio of residual interests of Real Estate Mortgage Investment Conduits (REMICS). This portfolio has been managed and maintained during years prior to, during and subsequent to the examination period. The IRS has indicated that it does not believe that, for various reasons, we have established sufficient tax basis in the REMIC residual interests to deduct the losses from taxable income. We disagree with this conclusion and believe that the flow through income and loss from these investments was properly reported on our federal income tax returns in accordance with applicable tax laws and regulations in effect during the periods involved and have appealed these adjustments. The appeals process is ongoing and may last for an extended period of time, but at this time it is difficult to predict with any certainty when it may conclude. The assessment for unpaid taxes related to the REMIC issue for these years is \$197.1 million in taxes and accuracy-related penalties, plus applicable interest. Other adjustments during taxable years 2000 through 2007 are not material, and have been agreed to with the IRS. On July 2, 2007, we made a payment on account of \$65.2 million with the United States Department of the Treasury to eliminate the further accrual of interest. We believe, after discussions with outside counsel about the issues raised in the examinations and the procedures for resolution of the disputed adjustments, that an adequate provision for income taxes has been made for potential liabilities that may result from these assessments. If the outcome of this matter differs materially from our estimates, it could have a material impact on our effective tax rate, results of operations and cash flows.

We could be adversely affected if personal information on consumers that we maintain is improperly disclosed.

As part of our business, we maintain large amounts of personal information on consumers. While we believe we have appropriate information security policies and systems to prevent unauthorized disclosure, there can be no assurance that unauthorized disclosure, either through the actions of third parties or employees, will not occur. Unauthorized disclosure could adversely affect our reputation and expose us to material claims for damages.

S-22

Table of Contents

The implementation of the Basel II capital accord, or other changes to our customers' capital requirements, may discourage the use of mortgage insurance.

In 1988, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision developed the Basel Capital Accord (Basel I), which set out international benchmarks for assessing banks' capital adequacy requirements. In June 2005, the Basel Committee issued an update to Basel I (as revised in November 2005, Basel II). Basel II was implemented by many banks in the United States and many other countries in 2009 and may be implemented by the remaining banks in the United States and many other countries in 2010. Basel II affects the capital treatment provided to mortgage insurance by domestic and international banks in both their origination and securitization activities.

The Basel II provisions related to residential mortgages and mortgage insurance, or other changes to our customers' capital requirements, may provide incentives to certain of our bank customers not to insure mortgages having a lower risk of claim and to insure mortgages having a higher risk of claim. The Basel II provisions may also alter the competitive positions and financial performance of mortgage insurers in other ways.

We may not be able to recover the capital we invested in our Australian operations for many years and may not recover all of such capital.

We have committed significant resources to begin international operations, primarily in Australia, where we started to write business in June 2007. In view of our need to dedicate capital to our domestic mortgage insurance operations, we have reduced our Australian headcount and are no longer writing new business in Australia. In addition to the general economic and insurance business-related factors discussed above, we are subject to a number of other risks from having deployed capital in Australia, including foreign currency exchange rate fluctuations and interest-rate volatility particular to Australia.

We are susceptible to disruptions in the servicing of mortgage loans that we insure.

We depend on reliable, consistent third-party servicing of the loans that we insure. A recent trend in the mortgage lending and mortgage loan servicing industry has been towards consolidation of loan servicers. This reduction in the number of servicers could lead to disruptions in the servicing of mortgage loans covered by our insurance policies. In addition, current housing market trends have led to significant increases in the number of delinquent mortgage loans requiring servicing. These increases have strained the resources of servicers, reducing their ability to undertake mitigation efforts that could help limit our losses. Future housing market conditions could lead to additional such increases. Managing a substantially higher volume of non-performing loans could lead to disruptions in the servicing of mortgage.

Risks Related to Our Common Stock

Our common stock may be subject to substantial price fluctuations due to a number of factors, and those fluctuations may prevent our shareholders from reselling our common stock at a profit.

The market price of our common stock could be subject to significant fluctuations and may decline. The following factors, among others, could affect our stock price:

our historical operating and financial performance and how such performance compares to results anticipated by analysts or investors;

market expectations, and changes in expectations, about our prospects, including future operating and financial performance measures, such as new insurance written, paid and incurred losses, and net income or

net loss;

S-23

Table of Contents

speculation in the press or investment community;

trends in our industry and the markets in which we operate;

announcements of material transactions, such as acquisitions, strategic alliances, joint ventures or financings, by us, our major customers or our competitors;

sales or the perception in the market of possible sales of a large number of shares of our common stock by our directors or officers; and

domestic and international economic, legal and regulatory factors unrelated to our performance.

Stock markets in general have recently experienced relatively high levels of volatility. These broad market fluctuations may adversely affect the trading price of our common stock.

The market price of our common stock could be negatively affected by sales of substantial amounts of additional equity securities by us.

Sales by us of a substantial amount of equity securities following this offering and the concurrent convertible notes offering, including additional